This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

UNIVERSAL HISTORY,

FROM THE

CREATION OF THE WORLD

TO THE

DECEASE OF GEORGE III., 1820

BY THE

HON. ALEXANDER FRASER TYTLER,

AND

REV. EDWARD NARES, D.D.

EDITED BY AN AMERICAN.

IN SIX VOLUMES

VOL. V.

NEW YORK:

HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS,

329 & 331 PEARL STREET,

FRANKLIN SQUARE.

1857.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
240 209
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1839, by

HARPER & BROTHERS,

In the Clerk's Office of the Southern District of New York.

CONTENTS.

BOOK THE SIXTH.

CHAPTER XXII.

Age of Leo X.—State of the Arts under the Goths—Revival in Italy—Cimabue—Academy for Painting instituted at Florence, 1350—Michael Angelo, Raphael, and Leonardo da Vinci—The different Italian Schools—Flemish School Dutch Statuary and Architecture—Art of Engraving . 9

CHAPTER XXIII.

Survey of the State of the principal Kingdoms of Asia in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries:—Selim reduces Egypt—Solyman takes Rhodes, subdues Hungary, Moldavia, and Wallachi—Selim II. takes Cyprus—Battle of Lepanto—Persians under Shah-Abbas—Government and Religion—Tartars—India, early particulars of—Aurungzebe—Bramins—Division of Castes 26

CHAPTER XXIV.

China and Japan:—Tartar Revolutions—Posterity of Gengis Khan finally maintain possession of the Throne—Pretensions to Antiquity considered 40

CHAPTER XXV.

M. Bailly's Theory of the Origin of the Sciences among the Nations of Asia 61

CHAPTER XXVI.

REIGN OF PHILIP II. OF SPAIN—REVOLUTION OF THE NETHERLANDS, AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF HOLLAND:—William of Nassau declared Stadtholder of the United Provinces—Philip acquires the Sovereignty of Portugal—Schemes against England—Defeat of the Armada—Death and Character of Philip II. 74

CHAPTER XXVII.

STATE OF FRANCE IN THE END OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY:—Religious Contentions—Conspiracy of Amboise—Death of Francis III.—Charles IX.—Massacre of St. Bartholomew—Henry III.—League of Peronne—Assassination of Henry III.—Henry of Navarre abjures the Protestant Faith, and is crowned in 1594—State of France—Character of Henry IV.—His Assassination in 1610 97

CHAPTER XXVIII.

ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND IN THE REIGNS OF ELIZABETH AND MARY, QUEEN OF SCOTS:—Personal Enmity of Elizabeth and Mary—Reformation in Scotland—Regency of Mary of Guise—John Knox—Intervention of England—Confession of Faith ratified by Parliament—Mary arrives in Scotland—Artful measures of Elizabeth in Scotland—Murder of Rizzio—of Darnley—Forced Abdication of Mary—James VI. proclaimed—Battle of Langsyde—Mary imprisoned in England—Executed, 1587—Ambitious schemes of the Earl of Essex—Death and character of Elizabeth . . . 104

CHAPTER XXIX.

GREAT BRITAIN, in the Reigns of JAMES I. and CHARLES I.—Accession of James VI. of Scotland to the throne of England—Change of popular feeling on the rights of the subject—Gunpowder Plot—His unworthy favourites—Pacific reign—Death—Charles I.—Differences with his first Parliament—Petition of Rights—Religious innovations attempted in England and Scotland augment the discontents—The National Covenant—Proceedings of Charles's last Parliament—Impeachment and Execution of Strafford—Bill passed declaring Parliament perpetual—Catholic Religion in Ireland made a pretext for the Parliament levying an Army—Bench of Bishops impeached and imprisoned—King impeaches five members of the House of Commons—Civil War—Solemn league and covenant—Scots cooperate with Parliament—Cromwell—Battle of Naseby—

Cromwell turns the Army against the Parliament—Trial and Execution of Charles—Reflections 125

CHAPTER XXX.

COMMONWEALTH OF ENGLAND, REIGNS OF CHARLES II. AND JAMES II. :—Charles II. acknowledged King in Scotland and Ireland—Marquis of Montrose—Cromwell defeats the Scots at Dunbar—Battle of Worcester—Navigation Act—Cromwell dissolves the Parliament by violence, and puts an end to the Republic—Barebones Parliament—Cromwell named Lord Protector—His successful Administration—Death—Richard his son resigns the Protectorate—the Rump Parliament—Disunion in the Council of Officers—General Monk—Charles II. proclaimed—Profuse and voluptuous Reign—War with Holland and France—Plague and Fire of London—Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle—Alarms of Popery—Titus Oates—Bill excluding the Duke of York from the Crown—Habeas Corpus Act—Distinction of Whig and Tory first used—Conspiracy of Russell, Sidney, and Monmouth—Death of Charles—James II.—Monmouth beheaded—Violent measures of James excite the disgust of all Parties—William, Prince of Orange—James escapes to the Continent—Crown settled on the Prince and Princess of Orange—Declaration fixing the Constitution . . . 148

CHAPTER XXXI.

ON THE CONSTITUTION OF ENGLAND :—Historical sketch of, up to the Revolution—The Legislative Power—Constitution of the House of Commons—House of Peers—The Executive Power—Powers of the Crown now limited—Habeas Corpus Act—Trial by Jury—Liberty of the Press . . 174

CHAPTER XXXII.

HISTORY OF FRANCE UNDER LOUIS XIII., AND OF SPAIN AND PORTUGAL UNDER PHILIP III. and IV.—Mary de Medicis Regent—Siege of Rochelle—Cardinal Richelieu—Death of Louis XIII.—Spain—Philip III.—Philip IV.—Degraded state of Spain—Portugal throws off the Spanish yoke—Constitution of Portugal—Constitution of Spain . 193

CHAPTER XXXIII.

GERMANY FROM THE ABDICATION OF CHARLES V. TO THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA—Ferdinand I.—Thirty years' War—Ferdinand II.—Palatinate laid waste—Gustavus Adolphus—Ferdinand III.—Peace of Westphalia . . . 204

CHAPTER XXXIV.

FRANCE UNDER LOUIS XIV.—Anne of Austria Regent—Cardinal Mazarin—Condé—Turenne—War of the Fronde—Cardinal De Retz—Treaty of the Pyrenees and of Oliva—Christina, queen of Sweden—Peace of Breda—Wars in Flanders—Triple Alliance—Sabatei Sevi—Louis attacks Holland—Death of Turenne—Peace of Minequar—Revocation of the Edict of Nantes—Louis continues the War in Germany—Peace of Ryswick—Spanish Succession—Prince Eugene—War with England—Marlborough—Battle of Blenheim—Gibraltar taken by the English—Battle of Ramillies—Louis's Schemes in favour of the Stuarts—Successors of the Allies—Battle of Malplaquet—Humiliation of Louis—Battle of Villa Vitiosa restores Philip to the Throne of Spain—Peace of Utrecht, 1713—Peace of Radstadt—Constitution of France under the Monarchy 209

CHAPTER XXXV.

PETER THE GREAT, CZAR OF MUSCOVY, AND CHARLES XII. OF SWEDEN:—Origin of the Russian Empire—Siberia conquered—Rapid extension in Asia—Peter the Great—Forms the first small body of regular Troops—Equips a Fleet—Travels in search of Knowledge—Returns to Russia—His vast Innovations—Charles XII. of Sweden—Confederacy against—Defeats the Russians in the Battle of Narva—Invades Poland—Takes Warsaw and Cracow—Places Stanislaus on the Throne—Invades the Ukraine—Is defeated at Pultowa—Taken Prisoner by the Turks—Returns to his Dominions—Killed at Frederickshal—Character—Peter the Great puts his Son to Death—Death of Peter—Internal Improvements of his Empire 238

CHAPTER XXXVI.

VIEW of the PROGRESS of SCIENCE and LITERATURE in EUROPE, from the END of the FIFTEENTH to the END of the SEVENTEENTH CENTURY:—Progress of Philosophy—Lord Bacon—Experimental Philosophy—Des Cartes—Galileo—Kepler—Logarithms—Circulation of the Blood—Royal Society of London Instituted—Sir Isaac Newton—Locke—Progress of Literature—Epic Poetry—Ariosto—Tasso—Milton—Lyric Poetry—Drama—English and French—History 257

UNIVERSAL HISTORY.

BOOK THE SIXTH.

CHAPTER XXII.

Age of Leo X.—State of the Arts under the Goths—Revival in Italy—Cimabue—Academy for Painting instituted at Florence, 1350—Michael Angelo, Raphael, and Leonardo da Vinci—The different Italian Schools—Flemish School Dutch Statuary and Architecture—Art of Engraving.

In enumerating those great features in the history of the progress of the human mind, which exhibited themselves at the end of the fifteeenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries, we remarked the high advancement to which the fine arts attained in Europe, in the age of Leo X.

There are periods in which the human genius seems to turn strongly to one peculiar direction. In one period, the reasoning faculty seems chiefly to delight in contemplating its own powers, the nature and operations of the mind; in another, perhaps the imagination reigns predominant, and the general taste is attracted to works of fancy in poetry or romance. In another era the mechanic or the useful arts engross the general attention, and are cultivated with high success; in a fourth, as in the period of which we

now treat, the popular taste, delighted with the contemplation of beautiful forms, bestows its chief attention on the fine arts of painting, sculpture, and architecture.

The causes which give the bent or direction to the general taste, and consequently operate in the production of artists, or men eminent in the several departments of literature, sciences, and the arts, are not easily ascertained. That a great deal is owing to the operation of moral causes, I believe is certain; but I doubt greatly if they alone are sufficient to account for this remarkable distinction, of eras favourable and unfavourable for particular arts and sciences. By moral causes, I mean such as the following: the peaceful or happy situation of a country; the genius or taste of a prince, directed to one particular department of science or of art, together with a liberal disposition to encourage those who are eminent in that department: the accidental circumstance of a few illustrious men contributing by their favour to bring artists into observation and repute, and, by their example promoting a fashionable relish for their productions. To these we may add, what perhaps has no less influence, the aid derived by one artist from the studies of another; and the emulation that naturally takes place among all the professors of an art, where there are one or two of distinguished excellence.

These causes have unquestionably a very great influence in rendering certain periods more or less favourable than others; and we may observe in general, with regard to the fine arts, that, in order to their advancement, a state of society is required, wherein men can employ more attention on their pleasures than on their wants. The nation which enjoys peace and security, and where a great proportion of the people possess such a degree of wealth as to exempt them from laborious occupation, is the true soil for these arts to grow and flourish; and where any of the causes before-mentioned join their operation, still more

of all, it is not surprising that, under such advantages, they should attain a very high degree of perfection.

Yet still I am inclined to doubt if even all these concurring are sufficient to account for this phenomenon in its full extent. In the first place, we find that history shows many periods where most of these causes, sometimes all, have concurred, yet the effect has not resulted. Princes have inherited a taste for the fine arts, and lavished their rewards upon indifferent artists. Nations have enjoyed peace, and ease, and opulence, and individuals have sought with eagerness the productions of art of other countries and of other ages, because their own age and country were barren. In the next place, we find that, in those golden ages of the arts, the transition from a bad to a good taste, from obscurity to splendour, was so rapid and instantaneous, as not at all to resemble the slow and gradual operation of moral causes. In those ages the torch of genius seems to have dropped at once from heaven, and to have kindled all in a blaze around it.

In the period of ancient history, we have seen that remarkable splendour to which the fine arts arose in the age of Pericles. In modern times, the age of Leo X. is an era equally distinguished.

The art of painting lay long buried in the west, under the ruins of the Roman empire. It declined in the latter ages with the universal decay of taste and genius, and needed not an irruption of the Goths to lay it in the dust. The Ostrogoths, who subdued Italy, that people who were barbarians only in name, had they found it in splendour, would have industriously cherished and preserved it, as they did every monument of ancient grandeur or of beauty: but painting and sculpture were never high among the ancient Romans; and that the taste and genius for the imitative arts underwent a regular and natural decay, we have the strongest proof in examining the series of the coins of the lower empire.

Such of the arts as were found by the Goths, upon the conquest of Italy, were carefully preserved by them. Muratori, in treating of those ages, informs us that Theodelinda, queen of the Lombards, about the year 592, built a palace, in which she made paintings be put up, representing the heroic actions of the Lombards. That paintings were used in the churches under the Gothic monarchy in Spain, in a very early period, we know from one of the canons of the council of Eliberi, held in the year 305, which prohibits them as idolatrous.

Instead of extinguishing and suppressing, there is even a probability that the Goths were the improvers, if not the actual inventors, of some of the arts dependant on design. A collection of receipts are given by Muratori, from an ancient manuscript, written in the most barbarous Latin—from which, however, it is evident that the Goths, at that time, possessed a pretty extensive knowledge in the ornamental arts, particularly in that of the composition of mosaic. That they possessed taste and genius I will not pretend to assert. It is even probable that that mechanical knowledge which showed itself in those ages was in the subsequent times greatly diminished. The fine arts are said to have been revived in Italy by artists from Greece; and it seems highly probable that in that country, which had been eminently distinguished by their splendour and perfection, the taste should have been less entirely lost than in any other.

The most common notion is, that, about the end of the thirteenth century, Cimabue, a Florentine, observing the works of two Grecian artists, who had been sent for to paint one of the churches at Florence, began to attempt something of the same kind, and soon conceived that it would not be difficult to surpass such rude performances. His works were the admiration of his time; he had his scholars and his imitators, among these were Ghiotto, Gaddi, Tasi Cavallini, and Stephano Florentino; and the number of artists con-

tinued so to increase, that an academy for painting was instituted at Florence in the year 1350.

Still, however, the art was extremely low, and the artists, with great industry, seem to have had no spark of genius. The successors of Cimabue and of Ghiotto seem all to have painted in one manner. Their works are distinguished by a hard and rigid outline, sharp angles of the limbs, and stiff folds in the drapery; a contour, in short, in which there is not the smallest grace or elegance. Such, with little variation or improvement, was the manner of painting for above two centuries. The best artists valued themselves on the most scrupulous and servile imitation of nature, without any capacity of distinguishing her beauties and deformities. In painting a head, it was the highest pitch of excellence that all the wrinkles of the skin should be most distinctly marked, and that the spectator should be able to count every hair on the beard. Such was the state of painting till toward the end of the fifteenth century, when all at once, as if by some supernatural influence, it attained at a single step to the summit of perfection.

Nothing can more clearly demonstrate that the splendour to which the fine arts all at once attained, at the period of which we now speak was owing entirely to natural genius, and not to accidental causes, than this circumstance, that though many remains of the finest sculpture of the ancients existed, and were known in Italy for some centuries preceding this era, it was not till this time that they began to serve as models of imitation. Ghiotto, Cimabue, and their scholars, had seen some of the ancient statues, and many antique basso-relievoes met the eye in almost every street in Rome; but they had looked on them with the most frigid indifference: the case was, they found in them nothing conformable to their own miserable taste. These works now began to be regarded with other eyes. Michael Angelo, Leonardo da Vinci, and Raphael arose, men animated with the same

genius that had formed the Grecian Apelles, Zeuxis, Phidias, Glycon, and Praxiteles.

And the prodigy was not confined to Rome: Florence, Venice, and other cities of Italy, produced in the same period many geniuses self-taught like them, who left at an infinite distance all that had gone before them in the path of the arts. Nor was that genius even peculiar to Italy: Germany, Flanders, and Switzerland produced in the same age artists whose works are yet the admiration of Europe. Of these we shall speak in their turn, after having shortly characterized the greatest of the Italian masters, and the several schools of which the different merits are distinct and peculiar.

As the most ancient, and not the least remarkable of these, the school of Florence deserves to be first mentioned. Of this, the first of the great painters was Michael Angelo Buonarotti, born in the year 1474, whose works attracting the notice of Pope Julius II., he was called from Florence to Rome, where he has left in the pontifical palace and in the churches some of the most sublime specimens of his art. A most profound intelligence of anatomy, and a skill in design, formed upon the contemplation of the ancient sculptures, characterize the works of Michael Angelo. He understood most perfectly the human figure, but delighted too much to display his knowledge by exhibiting it in forced and violent attitudes. The subjects of his paintings are happily chosen to exhibit the grand, the sublime, and even the terrible; but he is ignorant of the beautiful. The strength with which he characterizes the muscles of the human body, and the violent fore-shortenings of limbs, are suitable to the persons of heroes, demi-gods, and devils, and these he has most happily represented; but his women are as muscular as the ordinary race of men, and his men are too much beyond nature.* Michael Angelo seems to have

* The merit of Michael Angelo was never more truly or forcibly expressed than by a Frenchman, the sculptor Falconet,

studied the human body divested of the skin, where the beginning and termination of the muscles are distinctly seen, and their separation marked by strong lines.

The paintings of Michael Angelo, are models of design; they are drawn with infantine skill, and to a young artist might almost supersede the imitation of the human figure, and the knowledge of anatomy; but they will not supply the place of the antique; for from that fountain Michael Angelo has adopted nothing else but skill and correctness of outline, without aiming at the attainment of grace or beauty; that was reserved for Raphael.

The Roman school owed its origin to Raphael, who was born at Urbino, in the year 1483. He soon departed from the dry manner of his master Perugino, and formed to himself one peculiarly his own, in which he has wonderfully united almost every excellence of the art. His invention and composition are admirable, his attitudes grand and sublime, his female figures in the highest degree beautiful. He understood the anatomy of the human figure as well as Michael Angelo, but he never offends by a harsh delineation of the muscles. His skill in the *chiarooscuro*, or in the effect of light and shade, is beyond that of Michael Angelo, and his colouring very far superior to him. In the action of his figures there is nothing violent and constrained, but all is moderate, simple, and gracefully majestic. Many painters there are, excellent in different departments, and several that, in one single department, may be found to exceed even Raphael; but in that supreme excellence, which consists in the union of all the various merits of the art, he stands unrivalled, and far removed from all competition.

who, after viewing two of his statues, observed—"J'ai vu Michel Ange—il est effrayant."—"I have seen Michael Angelo—he is terrifying."

In the article of female beauty, Raphael has gon beyond every other artist, and even beyond the antique itself. In his Madonnas, in his St. Cecilia, and in his Galatea, imagination cannot reach a finer conformation of features. In painting the Galatea, he says himself in one of his letters, that, unable to find among the most beautiful women that excellence which he aimed at, he made use of a certain divine form or idea which presented itself to his imagination.*

In his portraits, he seems to have confined himself to the perfect imitation of nature, without desire to raise or embellish, but without that minute and servile accuracy which distinguishes the works in that style of some of the Flemish masters.

The union of all these excellences, which has placed Raphael at the head of all the painters that ever the world produced, was attained by a youth who never reached the middle period of life. Raphael died at the age of thirty-seven. What may we suppose he would have been had he lived to the age of Titian or Leonardo da Vinci?

The school of Lombardy, or the Venetian school, arose in the same age; of which the most eminent artists were Titian, Giorgione, Correggio, and Parmegiano. Titian, by the strength of genius alone, and with much fewer advantages than Michael Angelo or Raphael, attained to a very high degree of excellence. The praise of Titian in painting the human body is, that it is nature itself. In portrait, therefore, he peculiarly excelled, and, above all, in the representation of female beauty. Without an extreme brilliancy, there is such propriety and truth in his colouring, that his naked figures seem animated flesh. His historical pieces are not numerous: perhaps he wanted invention, and did not excel in composition; but in the introduction of a few figures, he often unites the grace

* See Bellori, Descriz. delle imagine da Raff. d'Urbino.

and dignity of Raphael. Leo X., who wished to make Rome the centre of all excellence in the fine arts, would have tempted Titian thither with very splendid offers. He was invited at the same time by Francis I. to reside in France, and by Henry VIII. to the court of England. The Emperor Charles V. bestowed on him the highest honours and rewards. But Venice was the residence which he chose; and wherever he himself might remain, he knew that his works would find their way over all Europe. To the merit of Titian there can be no higher testimony than that of Michael Angelo, who declared, that, had it been his fortune to have studied at Rome or Florence, amid the great masterpieces of antiquity, he would have eclipsed all the painters in the world.

Giorgione, the rival of Titian, of the same school, had he lived, might have attained perhaps to equal reputation, but he died at the age of thirty-three Titian lived to the age of one hundred.

Of the same Venetian school, and contemporary with these, were Correggio and Parmegiano. The art of colouring, though carried to a great height by Raphael and by Titian, was not brought to perfection. Correggio, in this respect, was superior to all that preceded, perhaps all that have followed him. The effect of light and shade, though often eminently conspicuous in the works of Raphael and of Titian, seems in these painters to be frequently accidental, as in some of their paintings it is not at all striking. But in Correggio it was the result of study, and was always surprising. From this intimate knowledge of the power of colours artfully contrasted, and the effect arising from a judicious distribution of strong lights and shades, the pictures of Correggio are perhaps more generally pleasing than those of any other painter. Divested of these and considered only in the outline or design, they are not possessed of consummate merit. In that particular, Raphael and Mi-

chael Angelo are so infinitely superior as to be beyond all comparison with other painters.

Francesco Parmegiano had so thoroughly adopted the graceful manner of Raphael, that it was said the soul of that great painter had, after his death, found itself a new body. But the figures of Parmegiano, though highly graceful, have often a degree of affectation: *his* is that grace which is the result of study, whereas in Raphael it is the result of ease and nature. His taste perhaps might have become more chaste and simple as he advanced in years, but he died at the age of thirty-six. These three—the Florentine, the Roman, and the Venetian—are the chief of the Italian schools of painting. The Florentine is distinguished by grandeur and sublimity, and great excellence of design; but a want of grace, of beauty of colouring, and skill in the *chiaro-oscuro*. The character of the Roman is equal excellence of design, a grandeur tempered with moderation and simplicity, a high degree of grace and elegance, and a superior knowledge, though not an excellence, in colouring. The characteristic of the Venetian is the perfection of colouring, and the utmost force of the *chiaro-oscuro*, with an inferiority in every other particular.

These original schools gave birth to many others. To the school of Raphael succeeded that of the Carraccis, which may be termed the second Roman school. The Caraccis were three brothers, all of them eminent in their art, but of whom Annibal was the most excellent. He left many scholars of great reputation as Guercino, Albano, Lanfranc, Dominechino, and Guido. Guercino distinguished himself by a graceful and very correct design: the airs of his heads are admirable. Albano painted nymphs, goddesses, and Cupids, with great beauty and delicacy, and in a most pleasing style of colouring: the landscape of his pieces is in general extremely fine. Lanfranc painted chiefly in fresco, and with great force and beauty. Dominechino excelled in character and expression, and

Guido in strength and sweetness, with which he united a great deal of majesty. His colouring, however, is in general cold and unpleasant, unless in the famous picture of the Aurora, where he has given all the splendour of colouring which the subject required.

In the age of Leo X. the Flemish school likewise produced its masters, who, though in a different style, and very inferior to the Italian, had, like them, taken a very surprising stretch beyond the abilities of their predecessors. Nature was the prototype of the Flemish, and the antique that of the Italians. John Van Eyk, a Fleming, had, about the beginning of the fifteenth century, found out (or at least greatly improved) the manner of tempering the colours with oil instead of water; and this invention, which gave to painting a greater durability, as well as a warmth more approaching to nature, was very soon adopted by the artists both of Flanders, of Germany, and of Italy. In Flanders, Heemskirk, Martin Vos, Frans Florus, and Quintin Matsys, were deservedly distinguished. In Germany, Albert Durer raised the reputation of the art of painting, which in that country was till then extremely low. Without the least conception of the beauties of the antique, this artist, by ability in design and skilfulness of composition, has produced some wonderful pieces. In his heads there is something uncommonly excellent; but the bodies of his figures are lean, weak, and ungraceful; and we seldom find in any of his works a happy effect of light and shade: yet in this painter there was so much of an original genius, that Raphael himself admired and valued his productions.

Among the Flemish painters, such at least as were so by nation, Rubens has unquestionably attained the highest rank. He studied with perfect intelligence the ancient models, as well as the works of the best of the Italian artists: but such is the force of a natural and constitutional taste, that his figures, though eminently beautiful, are of that style of beauty which is peculiar to his own country. To the eye of an Ital-

ian the female figures of Rubens are too corpulent to be graceful; to us they are less exceptionable, because they approach nearer to that style of figure with which we are accustomed. In point of drawing, intelligence of anatomy, and the use of the muscles, Rubens is supremely excellent.

Switzerland, too, in this remarkable age, produced a painter of uncommon excellence; this was Hans Holbein. The latter pieces of this artist, probably painted after he had seen some of the works of the schools of Italy, are extremely pleasing. Holbein excelled in the knowledge of the *chiaro-oscuro*, and was an able colourist.

England, it would appear, at this time, had begun to manifest a taste in the fine arts. Erasmus, the friend of Holbein, persuaded that painter to travel to England, as the best field of encouragement for his merit. There the painter lived for many years in high favour with Henry VIII. and the chancellor Sir Thomas More. He was a most industrious artist; and there are at this day more of the works of Holbein in Britain, than in any other country of Europe.

Holland had likewise at this time its remarkable painters, of whom the chief merit was a most accurate representation of nature, but without any selection of the beautiful from the deformed; and often with a preference for the low, vulgar, and ludicrous. It is such nature, however, as is suited to the generality of tastes, for there are but a few who have a real feeling for the sublime and beautiful.

With the art of painting, those of sculpture and architecture were likewise revived and brought to high perfection. In sculpture, Michael Angelo stands unrivalled among the moderns. He has produced some works which are even equal to the antique. His statue of Bacchus is so exquisitely formed as to have deceived even Raphael, who judged it to be the work of Phidias or Praxiteles. But of all the sculptors of modern times, no other artist has approached near to

the merit of the antique, nor have there been in that department, an equal number who excelled as in painting. No position certainly can be worse founded than that of the Abbé du Bos, who maintains that to excel in sculpture does not require so great a degree of genius as to be eminent in painting. That this notion is erroneous, there cannot be a stronger proof than the comparative numbers of eminent painters and sculptors. For one capital sculptor in the age of Leo, who was Michael Angelo, there existed ten capital painters.

The age of Leo was, likewise, the era of a good taste in architecture. The Grecian mode of architecture, which for many ages sunk entirely into neglect, while the Gothic was universally prevalent, began gradually to recover about the beginning of the fourteenth century. The Florentines, from their commercial voyages into the Levant, and intercourse with Greece, were the first who re-established the Grecian architecture in Italy. The church of St. Miniato, which was built at Florence in the year 1300, showed the first specimen of the renewed architecture of the ancients. The cathedral of Pisa, built soon after, was constructed by Buschetto, a Grecian architect, who introduced into it some entire columns which had been brought from the ruins of some of the ancient temples in Greece. This magnificent building served as a model for many others constructed in Italy about the same time.

From this period, architecture continued slowly advancing for about two centuries, till it was brought to great perfection in the age of Leo. Bramante, who had carefully studied all the best remains of the ancient buildings in Italy, had been chosen by Julius II. to design the plan of St. Peter's church, and upon his plan that immense and noble structure was begun. It was afterward superintended by different artists of great eminence, by San Gallo, by Raphael, and by Michael

Angelo, and varied probably by each of these in many particulars from its original plan.

Verona likewise, remarkable for some of the most entire and noblest monuments of ancient building, particularly its great amphitheatre, produced in this age many excellent architects—Jocondo, who raised several noble buildings for Lewis XII. of France; San Michael, who adorned his native city with some works in the true manner of antiquity, as did likewise Maria Falconetti. But all yielded to the universal genius of Michael Angelo, who, equally eminent in all the works of design, painting, sculpture, and architecture, applied himself in the latter part of his life chiefly to architecture. The church of St. Peter's owes to him its greatest beauty; and as that building is deservedly esteemed one of the most perfect models of architecture in the world, we must thence conclude Michael Angelo to have been one of the greatest architects.

In treating of the state of the fine arts in the age of Leo X., the art of engraving deserves to be particularly taken notice of as one of the finest of the modern inventions, and of which the first discovery was but a few years prior to the period of which we now treat. The Italians, the Germans, the Flemish, and the Dutch, have all contended for the honour of this invention. The opinion best founded is that engraving had its origin in Italy. Tomaso Finiguerra, a goldsmith of Florence, about the year 1460, discovered the method of taking off impressions from engraved silver plates with wet paper, which he pressed upon them with a roller. Andrea Mantigna, a painter, bethought himself of multiplying by that means copies of his own designs. From Italy the art travelled into Flanders, where it was first practised by Martin Schoen of Antwerp, of whose works there remain a very few prints, which are the most ancient engravings now known.

His scholar was the celebrated Albert Durer, who far surpassed his master in abilities. He engraved

with excellence in copper and in wood, and of his pieces a very great number have reached the present time. Considered as the first efforts of a new art, they have great merit. In some of those prints which he executed on silver and on copper, the engraving is elegant to a great degree. The immediate successors of Albert Durer were Lucas of Leyden, Aldegrave, and Sebald Behem, or Hisbens, who all engraved very much in the manner of Albert. In Italy, at the same time, Parmegiano had begun to etch some of his own beautiful designs, and is, by many, supposed to have been the inventor of the mode of engraving by means of aquafortis, which expresses the design of the artist with much greater freedom and spirit than the laboured stroke of the graver, though its lines have less softness and delicacy: a combination of the two is, therefore, most happily employed by the modern artist, and is productive of an excellent effect, especially in landscape. In Italy, likewise, Mark Antonio and Agostino, contemporaries of Parmegiano, were successfully employed in making engravings from the works of Raphael. These engravings were then much sought after, and are yet in request on account of their antiquity; but in point of merit, and as giving an idea of the beauties of the original, they have been infinitely surpassed by the works of posterior engravers.

There is no art whatever, which from its first discovery has undergone so rapid an improvement as that of engraving. When we compare the prints of Albert Durer, or of Lucas of Leyden, with those of Goltzius, engraved about seventy years after, the difference is perfectly astonishing. But when we come down about eighty years farther, and examine the prints of Poilly, Audran, and Edelinck, we are ready to acknowledge a proportional improvement. From that time to the present, in some respects the advancement has been equally sensible, though in others not so apparent. It must be readily confessed that the landscapes of Woollet are greatly superior to those of Bolowert,

Saddeler, and Bloemart; but it is a little doubtful whether the historical pieces of Strange, of Bartolozzi and Cunego, surpass those of Poilly, Edelinck, and Treij. This superiority has been achieved by Raphael Morghen.

The moderns, who have carried the use of the graver to a very great height, and have confessedly much improved in the art of etching, have now laid aside one mode of engraving practised by the ancient artists, and brought by them to a very great degree of perfection—engraving in wood with different teints, which was performed by different plates. The inventor of this art was Ugo da Carpi, an Italian; and it was brought to great perfection by Andrea Andreani, of Mantua. The spaces of white and the washes of which the middle teint is composed, give to these prints all the softness of drawing; and some experiments have been made in the same way with different colours, which give these performances in some degree the effect of painting.

As I shall not have another opportunity of particularly mentioning the arts dependant on design, it would be improper to quit the subject without taking notice of a mode of engraving different from all those I have mentioned, though its invention belongs to a period considerably later than that of which we now treat: I mean the mode of engraving in mezzotinto. It was invented by the celebrated Prince Rupert, son of the Elector Palatine, about the year 1650; and the hint was conceived from observing the effect of rust upon a soldier's fusil, incovering the surface of the iron with innumerable small holes at regular distances. Rupert, who was a great mechanical genius and virtuoso, concluded that a contrivance might be found to cover a plate of copper with such a regular ground of holes closely pierced as to give a black impression, which, if scraped away in proper parts, would leave the rest of the paper white; that thus light and shade might be as finely blended, or as strongly distinguished,

as by the pencil in painting. He tried the experiment by means of an indented steel roller, and it succeeded to his wishes. A crenulated chisel is now used to make the rough ground in place of the roller. This art has been brought to very high perfection. Its characteristic is a softness equal to that of the pencil, and it is therefore particularly adapted to portraits; and nothing, except the power of colours, can express flesh more naturally, the flowing of hair, the folds of drapery, or the reflection from polished surfaces. Its defect is, that where there is one great mass of shade in the picture, it wants an outline to detach and distinguish the different parts, which are thus almost lost in one entire shade; but in the blending of light and shade, there is no other mode of engraving that approaches to it in excellence.

The age of Leo, though principally distinguished by the perfection of the arts of design, was likewise a period of very considerable literary splendour. Ariosto, Bembo, and Sadolet, divided the favour of Leo and the esteem of the public with Raphael and Michael Angelo. Guicciardini in the same period rivalled the best historians of antiquity, and Machiavel shone equally in history, politics, philosophy, and poetry. But the literary genius of this age will fall to be more particularly treated afterward in giving a connected view of the progress of literature and of the arts and sciences from the beginning of the sixteenth to the end of the seventeenth century.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Survey of the State of the principal Kingdoms of Asia in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries:—Selim reduces Egypt—Solyman takes Rhodes, subdues Hungary, Moldavia, and Wallachi—Selim II. takes Cyprus—Battle of Lepanto—Persians under Shah-Abbas—Government and Religion—Tartars—India, early particulars of—Aurungzebe—Bramins—Division of Castes.

The Turks, we have seen, in the middle of the fifteenth century, subverted the empire of Constantinople, which, from that period, became the imperial seat of the Ottoman dominion. In treating of that great revolution, I took occasion to offer some considerations on the government and political constitution of the Turkish empire—that great fabric of despotism.

The Turks proceeded to extend their conquests. Mahomet II. subdued a great extent of territory. Selim I. added new conquests. In the year 1515, he made himself master of Syria and Mesopotamia, and undertook the reduction of Egypt, which was then in the possession of the Mamelukes, a race of Circassians who had been masters of that country ever since the last crusade. The arms of Selim put an end to their dominion; but, what is a very extraordinary fact, he allowed the last of the Mameluke kings to govern Egypt in the quality of his bashaw; and these Mamelukes, though nominally under the dominion of the Grand Seignior, continued in reality the sovereigns of the country, acknowledging but a very slender subjection to the Ottoman power.

Solyman, the son of Selim, who is termed Solyman the Magnificent, was a formidable enemy to the Christians and to the Persians. He took the island of Rhodes in the year 1521. The Knights of St. John were at this time in possession of this island, from which they had expelled the Saracens in 1310. They made a noble defence, assisted by the English, Ital-

nans, and Spaniards; but after a siege of many months were forced to capitulate. Solyman, a few years afterward, subdued the greatest part of Hungary, Moldavia, and Wallachia. He failed in his attempt upon Vienna; but turning his arms eastward against the Persians, he made himself master of Bagdad and subdued Georgia. He concluded a treaty of alliance with the French, which subsisted for two centuries. His son Selim II., in the year 1571, took the island of Cyprus from the Venetians; and this industrious people were carrying on a brisk trade with the Turks at the very time they were making this conquest. Genoa, Florence, and Marseilles were rivals with Venice in the trade of Turkey, for the silks and commodities of Asia. It is remarkable that the Christian nations have traded with the Ottoman empire to a very large extent, without its ever having been known that a Turkish vessel came into their ports for the purposes of commerce, in return for the vast fleets which they annually send to those of Turkey. All the trading nations of Christendom have consuls who reside in the seaports on the Levant, and most of them have ambassadors at the Ottoman Porte, while none are sent from thence to *reside* with other nations.

The Venetians, sensibly feeling the loss of Cyprus, which, besides the advantages of its produce, was a most convenient *entrepot* for their trade to the Levant —and finding their own force insufficient for its recovery from the Turks, applied to Pope Pius V. for the benefit of a crusade. The pope gave them more effectual aid, by waging war himself against the Ottoman empire, and by entering into a league for that purpose both with the Venetians and with Philip II. of Spain, the son and successor of Charles V. Pius, who was a good politician and a great economist, had amassed, in the course of his pontificate, such wealth as to render the holy see a very formidable power. The wealth of Philip II. was considered at that time as inexhaustible. A great armament was immediately

fitted out, consisting of two hundred and fifty ships-of-war, with fifty transports. Don John of Austria, brother of Philip (a natural son of Charles V.), was admiral of the fleet. Historians compute that the number of men on board was fifty thousand. The fleet of the Turks, who had not been wanting in their preparations, consisted likewise of two hundred and fifty galleys. These powerful armaments met in the gulf of Lepanto, near Corinth, and an engagement ensued, more memorable than any naval fight that had happened since the battle of Actium. All the ancient and all the modern weapons of war were used in this sea-fight, which terminated to the honour of the Christians. The Turks lost above one hundred and fifty ships; the number of their slain is said to have been fifteen thousand, and among these was Ali, the admiral of their fleet, whose head was cut off and fixed upon the top of his flag.*

Don John of Austria acquired by this signal victory a very high degree of reputation, which was still heightened by the taking of Tunis, about two years after. But from these successes the Christians, after all, did not derive any lasting advantage; for Tunis was very soon recovered, and the Ottoman empire was as powerful as before. The Turks, after the death of Selim II., preserved their superiority both in Europe and in Asia. Under Amurath II., they extended the limits of their empire into Hungary on the one side, and into Persia on the other. Mahomet III., the successor of Amurath, began his reign like a monster, by strangled nineteen of his brothers, and drowning twelve of his father's concubines, on the supposition of their being pregnant. Yet this barbarian supported the dignity of the empire and extended its dominions. From his death, which was in the

* In the battle of Lepanto, Cervantes, as he informs us in his inimitable romance of "Don Quixote," lost his left hand by the stroke of a Turkish sabre.

year 1603, the Ottoman power began to decline. The Persians at this period became the predominant power in Asia, under Shah-Abbas the Great, a prince who, in all his wars with the Turks, was constantly victorious. He gained from them many of their late acquisitions of territory; and effectually checking that career of success which had for several years attended their arms, he gave great relief to several of the princes of Europe, who at that time were scarcely able to defend their own dominions. Shah-Abbas thus involuntarily shielded the European kingdoms from the fury of the Turkish arms, as we have seen that Tamerlane and Gengis Khan had formerly been, in an in direct manner, the protectors of Constantinople.

Persia, under Shah-Abbas, was extremely flourishing. This vast empire had, some time before this period, experienced a revolution, somewhat similar to that which the change of religion produced in Europe. Toward the end of the fifteenth century, a new sect was formed by a Persian named Sophi, and his opinions were eagerly embraced by a great part of his countrymen, merely from the circumstance of thus distinguishing themselves from the Turks, whom they hated. The principal difference seems to have been that the reformer Sophi held Ali, the son-in-law of Mahomet, to have been the legitimate successor of the prophet; whereas the Mahometans generally acknowledged Omar the prophet's lieutenant. Sophi fell a martyr to his opinions: for he was assassinated by some of the opposite sect, in the year 1499. His son Ismael maintained his father's doctrines by force of arms: he conquered and converted Armenia and subdued all Persia, as far as Samarcand; and he left this empire to his descendants, who reigned there peaceably till the revolutions in the last century. The conqueror, Shah-Abbas, was the great grandson of this Ismael Sophi.

The government of Persia is as despotic as that of Turkey; but there seems to be this substantial differ

ence between the state of Turkey and of Persia, that the inhabitants of the latter enjoy their possession with some security, for the payment of a small tax or land-rent to the government. The kings of Persia receive presents from their subjects, as the Grand Seignior does; and according to Sir John Chardin's account, the king of Persia's new year's gifts amounted in those days to five or six millions of livres.

The crown of Persia is hereditary, with the exclusion of females from the succession; but the sons of a daughter are allowed to inherit the sovereignty. By the laws of Persia the blind are excluded from the throne. Hence it is a customary policy of the reigning prince to put out the eyes of all those of the blood royal of whom he has any jealousy.

The national religion of the Persians we have said is the Mahometan as reformed by Sophi. The slender difference of opinions between them and the Turks is the cause of an aversion much stronger than ever subsisted between the Protestants and Catholics. If a Persian were washing his hands in a river, he would conceive himself contaminated if he knew that a Turk had bathed in it. There are, however, various sects of Mahometans in Persia; and some of these adopt not a few of the tenets of Christianity. The ancient religion of Zoroaster, too, is yet preserved among the Persian Guebres, who pretend in their temples to have kept alive the sacred fire from the days of the great founder of their religion down to the present time. Of the religion of Zoroaster we formerly gave a full account.

The language of the Persians is extremely beautiful, and peculiarly adapted to poetical composition. Sir William Jones has given to the public several beautiful translations from that language, which display the utmost luxuriance of fancy; and Mr. Richardson, in his curious dissertation on the languages, literature, and manners of the Eastern nations, has given a pretty full account of the learning of the Per-

sians, who seem at one period (from the tenth to the thirteenth century) to have far surpassed in that respect the contemporary nations of Europe. The epic poet Firdousi, in his romantic history of the Persian kings and heroes, rivals Ariosto in luxuriance of imagination, and is said to equal Homer in the powers of description. The writings of Sadi and of Hafiz, both in prose and in poetry, are to this day in high estimation with those who are conversant in Oriental literature.

The trade of Europe with Persia is carried on by the gulf of Ormuz, and by the way of Turkey. The chief manufactures of Persia are raw and wrought silks, mohair, camlets, carpets, and leather; for which the English merchants give woollen cloths in exchange. The sovereign of Persia is himself the chief merchant, and he usually employs his Armenian subjects to traffic for his behoof in different quarters of the world. The agents of the king must have the refusal of all merchandise before his subjects are permitted to trade.*

To the north of Persia, that immense tract of country which is called Tartary had from time to time sent forth a succession of conquerors, who, carrying everything before them, produced astonishing revolutions in the continent of Asia. We have formerly taken notice of the subversion of the empire of the califs by this race of northern invaders. Mahmoud conquered Persia and a great part of India toward the end of the tenth century; Gengis Khan marched from the extremity of Tartary in the beginning of the thirteenth century, and subdued India, China, Persia, and Russia. Batoucan, one of the sons of Gengis, ravaged as far as the frontiers of Germany. Of the vast empire of Kapjac, which was the patrimonial inheritance of Batoucan, there remained in the last century no more

* The history of Persia has now been made fully and accurately known to Europeans by the writings of General Sir John Malcolm, who died in 1833.—Editor.

than Crim Tartary, which till lately was possessed by his descendants under the protection of the Turks. Tamerlane, whose conquests we have already taken notice of, was of the same nation of the Tartars, and of the race of Gengis.

To the north of China were the Mongol and Mantchou Tartars, who made a conquest of this country under Gengis, and who professed that religion, of which we shall presently speak, whose head is the Great Lama. Their territories again are bounded on the west by the empire of Russia. A variety of different hordes of wandering Tartars occupy the country extending from thence to the Caspian sea. The Sultan Baber,* great grandson of Tamerlane, subdued the whole country that lies between Samarcand, in the territory of the Usbecs, and Agra, one of the capitals of the Mogul empire. At that time, India was divided between four principal nations—the Mahometan Arabians; the ancient Parsees or Guebres: the Tartars of Gengis Khan and Tamerlane; and lastly, the real Indians in different castes or tribes.

The wandering Tartars follow at this day the life of the ancient Scythians. In the spring, a large body or horde, amounting perhaps to ten thousand, set out in quest of a settlement for the summer. They drive before them their flocks and herds; and when they come to an inviting spot, they live upon it till all its verdure is eaten up, and till the country supplies no more game for the chase. They exchange cattle with the Russians, the Persians, or the Turks, for money, with which they purchase cloth, silks, stuffs, and apparel for their women. They have the use of firearms, which they are very dexterous at making, and it is almost the only mechanical art which they exercise. They disdain every other species of labour, and account no employment to be honourable, unless that

* The curious Autobiography of Baber has recently been translated into English.—Editor.

of hunting. It is customary with them, as it is likewise with the Canadian savages, that when a man, from age, is incapable of partaking in the usual occupation of his tribe, they build him a small hut upon the banks of a river, and giving him some provisions, leave him to die, without taking any further charge of him.

The mode of life for the Tartars during the winter season is for each family to burrow itself under ground; and it is said that, for the sake of social intercourse, they have subterraneous passages, cut from one cabin to another, thus forming a sort of invisible town.

The inhabitants of Thibet, which is the most southern part of Tartary, do not follow the same wandering life with their northern brethren.

The religion and government of Thibet form one of the most extraordinary phenomena in the history of mankind. The kingdom of Thibet is governed by a young man personating a living god, who is called the Great Lama, or Dalai Lama. He resides in a pagoda or temple upon a mountain, where he is seen continually sitting in a cross-legged posture, without speaking or moving, except sometimes lifting his hand, when he approves of the addresses of his votaries. He appears to be a young man of fair complexion, between twenty and thirty years of age. Not only the people of Thibet, but the neighbouring princes, resort to the shrine of the Lama, and bring thither the most magnificent presents. The Lama is both the national god and the sovereign. He appoints deputies under him, the chief of whom is called the Tipa, who manages the temporal affairs of the kingdom, which it is beneath the dignity of the Lama ever to attend to. The creation of this prince, or god, is kept a most mysterious secret by the priests. When it is the misfortune of this poor image of divinity and sovereignty to fall sick, or to lose his youthful appearance, he is put to death by the priests, who have always another

young man whom they have privately educated and properly trained to supply his place. Thus the religion of the Lama is nothing else than an artful contrivance of the priests of Thibet to engross to themselves the sovereignty and absolute government of the country.

To the south of Thibet lie those countries known both in ancient and in modern times by the name of India; though neither that term nor the word Hindoo are proper to the country, but seem to have been given to those regions and their inhabitants by the Persians. In the Sanscrit, or ancient language of India, the country is called Bharata; a name which has not been given to it by any other nation. The earliest accounts which any of the ancient writers have transmitted to us of this country are those of Herodotus, who wrote his history about a century before the time of Alexander the Great; and it is singular that his accounts, though on the whole very meager and imperfect represent the character of the people and their manners precisely the same as those of the modern race of Hindoos. He takes notice of their living chiefly on rice, of their putting to death no animals, and clothing themselves with cotton. He informs us that Darius Hystaspes, about the year 508 before Christ, had sent Scylax of Caryandra to explore the river Indus; but Scylax had not the good fortune to be believed in the accounts which he gave of his journey. By the expedition of Alexander the Great into India, the Greeks received the first authentic accounts of those countries which border upon the river Indus. It is certain that this great conqueror penetrated into that part of the country which is now called the Punjab. Here the extreme distress which his army sustained from the monsoons, or periodical rains which fall in that country at stated seasons of the year, gave rise to an obstinate determination of his troops to proceed no farther. Alexander, therefore, with much mortification, was obliged to fix here the limits of his conquests.

He now embarked on the Hydaspes, which runs into the Indus, and pursuing his course down that great river for above a thousand miles, till it reaches the ocean, and subduing in his progress all the nations on both sides, he must have explored a great tract of the country of India. Of this expedition, his three officers, Ptolemy, Nearchus, and Aristobulus, kept exact journals, from which Arrian informs us that he compiled his history. The particulars given in those accounts relative to the manners of the people accord likewise entirely with all the modern accounts of the manners of the Hindoos.

After the death of Alexander, the Indian conquests of that monarch fell to the share of Seleucus, who made an expedition into the country, and, it is probable, maintained at least a nominal sovereignty over it. From that time, however, for near two centuries, we hear no more of India from any of the Greek writers till the period of Antiochus the Great, who made a short expedition into that country, and asserted a species of dominion over some of the Indian princes, by forcing them to give him presents of money and a number of elephants. The Greek empire of Bactria, it is probable, kept up an intercourse with the Indian countries in its neighbourhood; but from those times down to the end of the fifteenth century, no European power had any thought of establishing a dominion in India; the only intercourse which continued between the predominant powers of antiquity and that country being confined to the purposes of commerce. Egypt, during the time it was governed by the successors of Alexander, possessed exclusively the commerce of India, by means of the Red sea. When Egypt fell under the dominion of the Romans, the commodities of India continued as usual to be imported to Alexandria, and from thence to Rome. When the seat of the empire was removed to Constantinople, that capital became, of course, the centre of Indian commodities. But it was not only by sea that the Roman em-

pire maintained its communication with India. We perceive from the Geography of Ptolemy, who lived about two hundred years after the Christian era, that the route by land, across the desert, must have been at that time known; and we have, indeed, certain authority for the fact, that when the Romans had extended their conquests as far as the Euphrates, finding the intercourse established by caravans, which travelled at stated seasons from those provinces to India, they took advantage of that communication to import the Indian merchandise over land.

Thus, then, from the age of Alexander down to the period of the Portuguese discovery of the route to India by the Cape of Good Hope, we have seen that a commercial intercourse had subsisted between that country and Europe, both by sea and land. It is, however, only since the period of that important discovery that the country of India has become familiarly known to us, and all the wonders of the Indian policy and system of manners laid open; which prove that great nation to have been perhaps the most early civilized, or at least in remote periods, the most refined and enlightened of the nations upon the earth.

Long prior, however, to this last period, and as early as the year 1000 after the Christian era, the Mahometans had begun to establish a dominion in India. Mahmoud, a Tartar soldier of fortune, usurping from the Saracens a large part of the kingdom of Bactria, pushed his conquests first into the eastern parts of Persia, and thence into India, establishing the seat of his sovereignty at Gazna, near the source of the river Indus. Thence he pursued his course toward Delhi, ravaging the country in his progress, and signalizing himself by the most ardent zeal for the extirpation of the Hindoo religion. In the year 1194, Mohammed Gori penetrated into India as far as Benares, the great seat of the Hindoo religion and science, to which he showed himself as great an enemy as his predecessor. One of his successors fixed the seat of his empire at Delhi,

which continued thenceforth to be the capital of the Mogul princes. The sovereignty founded in India by Mahmoud was overwhelmed in the year 1222 by Gengis Khan, as was his empire in the succeeding century by Tamerlane, whose posterity at this day nominally fill the throne of the Mogul empire.

The peninsula of India within the Ganges, we have seen, was invaded by the Portuguese in the beginning of the sixteenth century. They made their several establishments, and the viceroy, who resided at Goa, lived with all the splendour of an Asiatic sovereign. The subjects of the great Mogul purchased from the Portuguese the produce of the Indian Spice Islands.

The Mogul empire was, even in the beginning of the last century, one of the most extensive and most powerful on the face of the globe. It was then governed by Aurengzebe, a man signalized equally by his crimes and by his good fortune. The Mogul Shah Jehan, the father of Aurengzebe, had conferred on his four sons the dignity of viceroys, and given them the command of four principal provinces of the empire. Aurengzebe, the youngest of his sons, formed a conspiracy with one of his brothers to dethrone their father; accordingly the old emperor was seized and imprisoned, and soon after died, as was suspected, by poison. Aurengzebe now found it necessary to get rid of his brother, who was the accomplice of his crime; and he was no sooner removed, than this unnatural parricide openly took arms against his other two brothers, and, proving victorious, strangled them both in prison. It was the lot of this wretch, who merited a thousand deaths for his crimes, to enjoy a life prolonged to one hundred and three years, crowned with uninterrupted good fortune; to extend the limits of his empire over the whole peninsula of India within the Ganges, and to die one of the most splendid and powerful of the Asiatic monarchs.

The dominion of the Mogul was not absolute over all those countries which composed his empire.

When Tamerlane overran India, he allowed many of the petty princes to retain their sovereignties, of which their descendants long continued in possession. These were the rajahs, nabobs or viceroys, who exercised all the prerogatives of kings within their dominions, only paying a tribute to the Great Mogul, as being the successor of Tamerlane their conqueror, and observing the treaties by which their ancestors had recognised his superiority.

The original inhabitants of India are the Hindoos, or Gentoos, who profess the religion of Brama. Their priests or bramins pretend that their god or prophet Brama bequeathed to them a book called the Vedam, which contains his doctrines and institutions; but as this book is written in the Sanscrit, which is now a dead language, and only understood by these priests, they give what interpretation they please to the text of this religious code, and different bramins often extract from it the most opposite doctrines and opinions. Throughout all Hindostan the laws of government, customs, and manners make a part of religion, being all transmitted from Brama, the author of this sacred volume. It is from Brama that the Indians derive their veneration for the three great rivers of their country, the Indus, the Krisna, and the Ganges. To him they ascribe the division of the people into tribes or castes, distinguished from each other by their political and religious principles. This division of the Indian castes, is characteristic of a very singular state of society. The four principal castes, or tribes, are the bramins, the soldiers, the husbandmen, and the mechanics. The bramins, as we have already observed, are the priests, who, like the Roman Catholic clergy, are some of them devoted to a life of regular discipline, as the different orders of monks; and others, like the secular clergy, mix in the world, and enjoy all the freedom of social life. The military class includes the rajahs on the coast of Coromandel, and the Nairs on the coast of Malabar. There are likewise

whole nations, for example the Marhattas, who follow arms as an hereditary profession, and who are a kind of mercenaries, who serve for pay to any power that chooses to employ them. The husbandmen, like the soldiers, follow invariably the profession of their ancestors, and occupy themselves solely in the cultivation of their lands. The tribe of mechanics is branched out into as many subdivisions as there are trades, and no man is allowed to relinquish the trade of his forefathers—a very singular system, which, as we formerly mentioned, prevailed likewise among the ancient Egyptians. Besides these four principal classes, or tribes, there is a fifth, that of the Pariahs, which is the outcast of all the rest. The persons who compose it are employed in the meanest offices of society They bury the dead; they are the scavengers of the town; and so much is their condition held in detestation, that if any one of this class touches a person belonging to any of the four great castes or tribes, it is allowable to put him to death upon the spot. All these classes, or castes, are separated from each other by insurmountable barriers; they are not allowed to intermarry, to live, or to eat together; and whoever transgresses these rules is banished as a disgrace to his tribe. It is well observed by the Abbé Raynal, that this artificial arrangement, which is antecedent to the tradition of known records, is a most striking proof of the great antiquity of this nation; since nothing appears more contrary to the natural progress of the social connexions, and such an idea could only be the result of a studied plan of legislation, which presupposes a great proficiency in civilization and knowledge.

Between the years 1751 and 1760 the English East India Company conquered and obtained possession of the finest provinces of Hindostan—Bengal, Bahar, and part of Orissa, a territory equal in dimensions to the kingdom of France, abounding in manufacturing towns, possessed of an immense population, and yield-

ing a magnificent revenue; and these territories have been constantly and rapidly extending from that period. The East India Company thence has the benefit of the whole trade of India, Arabia, Persia, Thibet, and China; and, with the exception of some settlements ceded to the Dutch of the whole of Eastern Asia.

CHAPTER XXIV.

CHINA AND JAPAN:—Tartar Revolutions—Posterity of Gengis Khan finally maintain possession of the Throne—Pretensions to Antiquity considered.

PROCEEDING eastward in the Asiatic continent, the next great empire which solicits our attention is that of China. Toward the end of the thirteenth century, the Tartar posterity of Gengis Khan were possessed of the sovereignty of China, of India, and Persia. The branch of this Tartar family which then reigned in China was termed Yuen: for the conquerors adopted both the name and the manners of the people whom they conquered. The Chinese were at this time a much more polished people than their invaders, who, therefore, very wisely retained their laws and system of government. The consequence was an easy submission upon the part of the Chinese, who, while they were allowed to follow in quiet and security their ordinary method of life, were very indifferent who sat upon the throne. After this conquest there were nine successive emperors of the family of the Tartars, nor was there the least attempt by the Chinese to expel these foreigners. One of the grandsons of Gengis Khan was, indeed, assassinated in his imperial palace, but it was by one of his own countrymen, a Tartar; and his next heir succeeded to the throne without the smallest opposition.

At length indolence and luxury put an end to this race of monarchs. The ninth emperor in descent from Gengis Khan abandoned himself to the most effeminate pleasures, and giving up the whole administration to a set of priests, excited at length both the contempt and abhorrence of his subjects. A rebellion was raised by one of the bonzes, and the Tartars were utterly extirpated from China in the year 1357. The Chinese were now governed for two hundred and seventy-six years by their native princes; but at the end of this period a second revolution gave the throne once more to the Tartars. This revolution affords a singular picture of the national character of the Chinese. Some violences committed against the Mantchou Tartars had given high provocation to this warlike people, and they determined to invade the empire. Their attempt was favoured by an insurrection in some of the provinces; the Tartars met with very little resistance. The rebel Chinese, headed by a mandarin of the name of Listching, joined themselves to the Tartarian army, and both together took possession of the imperial city of Pekin. The conduct of the Chinese emperor is unparalleled in history: without making the smallest attempt to defend his capital or maintain possession of his throne, he shut himself up in his palace, and commanded forty of his wives to hang themselves in his presence; he then cut off his daughter's head, and ended the catastrophe by hanging himself. The Tartars took possession of Pekin, and their prince Taitsong pursued his conquests till the whole empire submitted to his authority. This, which is the last revolution that China has undergone, happened in the year 1641; since which time the empire has peaceably submitted to the government of the Tartar princes who are now upon the throne, and who, like their predecessors of the race of Gengis Khan, very wisely maintain the Chinese laws, manners, and customs, without innovation.

The history of this celebrated empire has afforded

a most fertile field of historical controversy. While the Chinese annals, which go back for some thousands of years beyond our vulgar era, are by some authors, esteemed incontrovertible; while the government and political establishment of this empire are vaunted as a most perfect model of an excellent constitution, and the knowledge of the Chinese in the arts and their acquaintance with the sciences are supposed to have preceded, by many ages, the first dawnings of either in the European kingdoms—there are other authors, no less respectable for the solidity of their judgment and the extent of their information, who are disposed to treat all these accounts as a gross exaggeration and imposture; who consider the boasted antiquity of this great empire, or, at least, the authenticity of its ancient history, as an absurd chimera—the policy and government of China as an establishment meriting no encomium—and the abilities of the Chinese in the arts, and progress in the sciences, even of those which they are supposed to have practised for thousands of years, to be, at this day, extremely low and inconsiderable. Voltaire and the Abbé Raynal are the most distinguished advocates of the hyperbolical antiquity of this singular people; and the fables of the Chinese have received from them a credence which might not have been so readily accorded, had they not afforded to these authors an opportunity of throwing discredit on the Mosaic accounts of the creation and of the deluge.

The empire of China, say these authors has subsisted in splendour for above four thousand years, without having undergone any material alteration in its laws, manners, language, or even in the mode and fashion of dress. Its history, which is incontestable, being the only one founded on celestial observations, is traced by the most accurate chronology so high as an eclipse calculated two thousand one hundred and fifty-five years before our vulgar era, and verified by the missionaries skilled in mathematics. Father Gau-

bil has examined a series of thirty-six eclipses of the sun recorded in the books of Confucius, and found only two of them dubious, and two spurious. Thus the Chinese have joined the celestial to the terrestrial history, and proved the one by the other. "In the history of other nations," says Voltaire, "we find a mixture of fable, allegory, and absurdity; but the Chinese have written their history with the *astrolabe* in their hands, and with a simplicity unexampled in that of any other of the Asiatic nations." Every reign of their emperors has been written by a contemporary historian, nor is there any contradiction in their chronology. "With regard to the population of the empire," says Voltaire, "there are in China, by the most accurate computation, one hundred and thirty millions of inhabitants, and of these not less than sixty millions of men capable of bearing arms. The emperor's ordinary revenue is about fifty-two millions sterling. The country of China is greatly favoured by nature, producing everywhere, and in the utmost abundance, all the European fruits, and many others to which the Europeans are strangers. The Chinese have had a manufacture of glass for two thousand years; they have made paper of the bamboo from time immemorial; and they invented the art of printing in the time of Julius Cæsar. The use of gunpowder they have possessed beyond all memory, but they employed it only in ornamental fire-works."

They have been great observers of the heavens, and proficients in astronomy, from time immemorial. They were acquainted with the compass, but only as a matter of curiosity, not applying it to navigation. 'But what the Chinese best understood," says Voltaire, "is morality and the laws; morality they have brought to the highest perfection. Human nature is addicted there, as in other countries, to vice, but is more restrained by the laws. All the poor in this extensive empire are maintained at the expense of government. A certain modesty and decorum softens and

tempers the manners of the Chinese, and this gentleness and civility reaches even to the lowest class of the people. In China, the laws not only inflict punishment on criminal actions, but they reward virtue. This morality and this submission to the laws, joined to the worship of a Supreme Being, constitute the religion of China, as professed by the emperor and men of literature. Confutzee, or Confucius, who flourished two thousand three hundred years ago, was the founder of this religion, which consists in being just and beneficent. He has no divine honours paid to himself, but he has such as a man deserves who has given the purest ideas that human nature, unassisted by revelation, can form of the Supreme Being. Yet various sects of idolaters are tolerated in China, as a grosser sort of food is proper for the nourishment of the vulgar."

Such is the picture of this eastern empire drawn by M. de Voltaire and the Abbé Raynal. To show what portion of it belongs to historic truth, and what to the imagination of its authors, we shall consider separately the state of the sciences in China, the state of the arts, the government and laws of this empire, and the progress of the Chinese in religion, philosophy, and morality.

First, with regard to the state of the sciences. "The prodigious antiquity of the Chinese empire," says M. de Voltaire, "is authenticated beyond a doubt by astronomical observations, particularly by a series of eclipses of the sun, going back so far as two thousand one hundred and fifty-five years before our vulgar era." The evidence of this fact of the series of eclipses, it is to be observed, in the first place, rests upon the authority of certain Jesuits, who, travelling as missionaries into that empire, from which it is a piece of national policy to exclude all strangers, were obliged to court and purchase the privilege of residence in the country by the grossest flattery and adulation of the emperor. Some of these, being men of science, were

employed to examine and to put in order the astronomical apparatus in the observatory of Pekin, and to teach their learned men the use of those instruments of which they were possessed, but of which they were grossly ignorant. These Jesuits themselves relate that, about the beginning of the last century, the science of astronomy was so low among the Chinese, that some of their mathematicians, having made a false calculation of an eclipse, upon being accused to the emperor, defended themselves by saying, that their whole calendar was erroneous. The Jesuits were hereupon employed to rectify it—a circumstance which gained them no small credit in the empire.

Now let it be supposed that a modern mathematician, having access to the Chinese astronomical observations, should find that most of those eclipses recorded were calculated with accuracy, it may be asked, what, after all, would this prove? Any ordinary mathematician, who can calculate a single eclipse, can calculate backward a whole series of them for thousands of years. Thus any man who wished to compile a history fictitious from beginning to end, might, while sitting in his closet, in this way authenticate every remarkable event by eclipses and astronomical observations which would stand the strictest scrutiny. Thus every event in the famous history of Arthur and his Round Table, or of the Seven Champions of Christendom, might have its date authenticated by eclipses and astronomical observations, and consequently (according to the argument of M. de Voltaire) be entitled to the credit of a history as incontestable as the annals of China.

But to come to a more particular examination of this boasted knowledge of the Chinese in astronomy, let us attend, in the first place, to a few facts. In the year 1670, the Chinese astronomers had gone so totally wrong in their calculations, that by a false intercalation the year was found to consist of thirteen months. To remedy this error, an imperial edict was issued for

the printing of forty-five thousand new almanacs, three thousand of which were distributed in each province of the empire.

For above two hundred years, what is termed the Tribunal of Mathematics in China has been filled, not by native Chinese, but by Mahometans and Jesuits. It is these men who have made all their astronomical calculations, and had the charge of the Chinese observatory. There are, indeed, some nominal professors of astronomy among the Chinese themselves, but these are so grossly ignorant as to adhere with great obstinacy to an ancient opinion, that the earth is of a square figure.

Before the arrival of the Jesuits, it is acknowledged that the Chinese were possessed of astronomical instruments, and *pretended* to make observations on the heavens. The possession of these instruments is urged as an argument of very considerable proficiency in astronomy and mechanics, and the argument is apparently a good one. But let us remark one fact: the latitude of Pekin is thirty-nine degrees, fifty-five minutes, and fifteen seconds—the latitude of Nankin thirty-two degrees, four minutes, and three seconds; yet all the sun-dials and astronomical instruments, both at Pekin and Nankin, are constructed for the latitude of thirty-six degrees: so that it is absolutely impossible that the Chinese could have made a single just observation at either of these capitals of the empire. A very probable conjecture has been formed with regard to the cause of this singularity. The city of Balk in Bactriana (now Bucharia) is situated in the thirty-sixth degree of north latitude. The sciences began to be cultivated in this city by the Greeks, who, having obtained the government of this province, under the successors of Alexander the Great, shook off their dependance, and founded a pretty extensive empire. In the time that China was governed by the first dynasty of the Tartar princes, these instruments made for the latitude of Balk, have

been transported to China, and the Chinese have, at that time, acquired some smattering of their use. Hence the origin of one of the most absurd and disgraceful errors, which the Jesuits acknowledge was maintained by all the Chinese astronomers, that the whole cities of China were situated in the thirty-sixth degree of latitude. As for longitude, they had not the most distant idea of it; yet these are the people who are said to have cultivated the science of astronomy for four thousand years, and whose history is authenticated, beyond a doubt, by a course of celestial observations begun before the deluge!

The knowledge of the Chinese mandarins has been highly extolled by the admirers of this eastern nation; and much has been said of those rigid examinations which are undergone before the admission into this office and dignity. Supposing this to be a fact, the reason of these scrupulous trials is very obvious. It arises from the nature of the Chinese language and structure of its characters. It would be no difficult matter, in most countries, to be convinced in a few minutes whether a person is able to read and write. To discover this in China, requires a very tedious examination. It is requisite, for instance, to the office of a mandarin, that he should be acquainted with ten thousand characters. He must, therefore, be examined on them all before the extent of his knowledge is ascertained; and still a more tedious inquisition is necessary, to know how many of these characters he can write. But all this rigorous examination is, in fact, a fiction. It is notorious that the office of mandarin is venal in China, as are most other offices; nor is any other qualification necessary than the ability to advance a handsome sum of money.

There is no science more cultivated by the Chinese than that of medicine, yet there is none in which their knowledge is so contemptible. There is not a physician among them who knows anything of the internal structure of the human body. They determine

the nature of all diseases by feeling the pulse, and the most usual cure for any topical affection is searing the parts affected with a hot iron. The foolish belief of an *elixir vitæ*, is predominant in China, and is a great object of the researches of their physicians.

The abilities of the Chinese in the arts have been no less vaunted than their progress in the sciences; and we are assured by their panegyrists, that what have been esteemed the most important discoveries of the moderns, have been possessed by them from time immemorial. "The knowledge of gunpowder," says M. de Voltaire, "they have possessed beyond all memory. They invented the art of printing in the time of Julius Cæsar; and glass they have manufactured for above two thousand years." If it is asked, What is the authority for all these assertions? the answer is—The Chinese annals. If it is inquired, How these annals are authenticated? the answer is—By astronomical observations. What is the force of this ultimate proof we have already seen? Yet, on the supposition of these facts being true, perhaps the severest satire on the knowledge of the Chinese in the arts, is to allow that they have possessed those discoveries from time immemorial, and then to inquire to what degree of perfection they have carried them. The discovery of gunpowder, either in Europe or in China, must have been accidental. The Europeans, immediately upon this discovery, improved it to the most astonishing purposes, and produced with it the most powerful effects. The Chinese are said to have possessed this discovery for thousands of years—from time immemorial—yet could find no other use for it than to compose artificial fireworks. The use of firearms the Chinese learned from the Portuguese, and the form of their muskets is at this day precisely the same that it was in Europe three hundred years ago.

The art of printing is an invention little more than three centuries old in Europe, yet some of those books, which were printed within twenty years of the dis-

covery, display a degree of beauty and accuracy little inferior to the best specimens of modern typography. The Chinese are said to have possessed the knowledge of printing from the time of Julius Cæsar; but at this day they know not the use of moveable types, they print from blocks of wood, in which the characters are cut in the manner of sculpture. In this way the materials of a very small book are large enough to occupy a house; and such is the length of time requisite for so laborious a work as the printing of a book, that it seldom happens that the author of a moderate volume lives to see its publication.

The polarity of the loadstone is not a very ancient discovery in Europe; we find it but obscurely hinted at in some of the works of the twelfth century, yet it was not long known before it was applied to the noblest and most important purposes; and navigation undergoing at once the most rapid improvement, an intercourse began to be established between the remotest quarters of the globe. Upon the first visits of the Portuguese and Spaniards to China, this vain and superficial people, whose character it is to maintain a stupid indifference to all foreign improvements, and either to undervalue them or pretend that they are already acquainted with them, informed the Europeans that they were no strangers to the compass, but that they found no use for it.

Glass the Chinese are said to have manufactured for two thousand years; and perhaps the assertion, though incapable of proof, may be true, as it is difficult to suppose that the same people who have long practised the making of porcelain should have been ignorant of the manufacture of glass; but one fact is certain, it was not till the seventeenth century that they attained the art of making it transparent, and even at this day it is in that respect infinitely inferior to hat which is made in Europe.

There is great reason to presume that the Chinese have long practised the art of painting; yet, instead

of a liberal art, it has ever been with them a mere mechanic drudgery. Their paintings, with a splendour of colouring, and the most minute accuracy of penciling, have neither grace, beauty, nor justness of proportion. They have not the smallest notion of perspective. Instead of a gracefulness of attitude the taste of the Chinese painter delights its self with the expression of distortion and deformity. Let us here remark the contrast between these Asiatics and the Grecian artists. In the images of the gods, which it is to be presumed men would always choose to picture according to their most exalted ideas of beauty and majesty, the Greeks have given a character and expression noble almost beyond imagination. The idols of the Chinese are deformed, hideous, and disgusting beyond measure.

The architecture of the Chinese has the quality of lightness united with strength, and a great deal of variety; but it is possessed neither of the elegance and beauty of the Grecian, nor of the majesty of the Gothic.

Among the most remarkable of the works of architecture in China is the great wall built to protect the empire against the inroads of the Tartars. It extends five hundred leagues, and is forty-five feet in height and eighteen in thickness—a most singular monument both of human industry and of human folly. The Tartars, against whom it was meant as a defence, found China equally accessible as before its formation. They were not at pains to attack and make a breach in this rampart, which, from the impossibility of defending such a stretch of fortification, must have been exceedingly easy;—they had only to travel a little to the eastward, to about forty degrees of latitude, where China was totally defenceless. Marco Polo, the Venetian, went, with a troop of Tartars, to Pekin, in the thirteenth century, and returned from Italy, where he died, without ever having heard mention of this great wall; which circumstance has even induced a

suspicion that this immense structure has been built since his time.*

Among the few arts which the Chinese must be allowed to have carried to a high pitch of excellence is that of gardening. That beautiful method of embellishing or adorning, without confining or destroying nature, which is but very lately introduced into the gardens of England, was certainly borrowed from the practice of the Chinese. Even to the end of the seventeenth century, there prevailed in our gardens a formal and insipid regularity; and in the gardens of the continent of France, of Italy, and of Holland, there was not till very lately the smallest trace of that simple and picturesque beauty, which results from the natural diversity of hill and dale, or the judicious intermixture of lawn, of shade, of water, and of rock; yet the Chinese have long understood this happy embellishment of nature. If we may believe Sir William Chambers, who has written on this subject a very ingenious and amusing dissertation, the gardening of the Chinese is a science which proposes for its object, not only to amuse the eye, but to interest the passions.

Another art which the Europeans must not only allow the Chinese to have invented, but to have brought to a greater degree of perfection than any other nation who have attempted to imitate them in it, is the manufacture of porcelain or China ware. The superior

* This suspicion, however, is without foundation. It is known, with considerable certainty, that the wall of China was built in the third century before the Christian era.—Dahalde, tome ii. p. 45; De Guignes, tome ii. p. 59; Gibbon's Decline and Fall, &c., chap. xxvi. Marco Polo did not pass through Tartary to Pekin; but after having followed the usual track of the caravans as far to the eastward from Europe as Samarcand and Cashgar, he bent his course to the southeast, across the Ganges, to Bengal, and keeping to the southward of the Thibet mountains, reached the Chinese province of Shensee, passing thence to the capital, without interfering with the line of the great wall.—*Staunton's Account of the Embassy to China*, 1793, vol. ii. p. 185.

excellence of the Chinese porcelain to any that is made in Europe seems to consist in the intrinsic superiority of the materials which they employ. In point of beauty, the porcelain of Dresden, that of Sèvres, in France, and that of Derby, in England, are incomparably superior to anything that China has produced. There is more taste displayed in the form of the utensils; there is a greater beauty and variety in the colours; and the painting is such as the Chinese artists are in no capacity to rival: but the substance of the manufacture itself is inferior, it is more brittle and less capable of enduring a sudden heat: it partakes more of the nature of glass, and is in fact a different substance from the porcelain of China. The European manufacturers have not been able to discover a clay so pure, so white, or so fine in its consistency, as that which the Chinese employ, and they have been obliged to use too much of the flinty and vitrifiable substances, which makes the European porcelain approach more to the nature of enamel.

The government and laws of the Chinese have afforded to their admirers another subject of the most unbounded eulogium.

All authors agree in representing the emperor of China as absolute in the most unlimited sense of the word; but the encomiasts of the Chinese have veiled the despotism of their government under the more flattering appellation of a patriarchal constitution. The emperor, say they, is considered as the father of his people, who regard him as entitled to the same implicit obedience that a parent is entitled to exact from his children. The mandarins, or great officers of state, are the substitutes of the emperor, whose care it is to enforce this obedience: but the patriarchal system pervades the whole, and in all matters that regard not the public interest, or that of the sovereign, every father is judge in his own family, and his power is absolute over his children. With whatever name this extraordinary constitution may be dignified, it is

evidently nothing else than a blind and lawless despotism. Let us observe a few particulars upon the authority of Duhalde, Le Comte, and some of the historians of this empire who are most worthy of credit.

"There is not a subject of this empire," says Duhalde, "Chinese or Tartar, from the meanest peasant to the highest of the grandees, whom the emperor may not, at his pleasure, order to be bastinadoed." This despotic authority runs through every rank of the state, and each is entitled to tyrannize over his inferiors, as he himself is subjected to the tyranny of those who are above him. Upon the suspicion of treason, every viceroy has the power of inflicting capital punishment instantly, and without the necessity of any trial. We know, by our own laws, how extensive is the interpretation of the crime of treason, and may guess how easy it must be for judges invested with such discretionary powers to wrest almost every possible crime so as to bring it under that denomination.

There is, it is true, in China, a system of written laws, which, it may be supposed, are a fixed rule of conduct for all judges and magistrates in the exercise of their duty; but one circumstance renders these laws of very little avail: this is, that all the courts of judicature in China are supreme. There is no appeal from any sentence to a superior jurisdiction, and consequently no restraint upon judges against the commission of the greatest iniquity and oppression. Nay, in civil causes there are no laws whatever which regulate the decisions of their courts. Everything is in the breast of the judges, those mandarins whose offices are bought and sold, and consequently supplied often by men equally worthless and ignorant.

There is nothing more barbarous in the prosecution of crimes in China than that custom borrowed from the Scythians, by which all the relations of a criminal, to the ninth degree, are subjected to the same punishment as the offender himself. The husband

suffers for the guilt of his wife, the father for that of his children. Where the father is dead, the eldest son is responsible for all the younger, and each for each.

"The religion of China," says M. de Voltaire, "is of two kinds: one which, like a grosser species of food, is very proper for the vulgar, the other professed only by men of sense, the literati, the bonzes, and the emperor. The first is allowed to be the most superstitious and absurd idolatry; the other, natural religion, or the belief of one all-powerful and benevolent Being, whose most acceptable worship is the practice of virtue." It would, I imagine, be not a little difficult to discover a good political reason for this fact (supposing it to be one), of the Chinese government authorizing two species of religion so totally opposite and contradictory as pure deism and gross idolatry. If the emperor, the bonzes, and the literati judge the worship of one great and benevolent Being to be a more rational system of religion than that idolatry, which is practised by the common people, what political reason should prevent them from instructing these likewise in that rational religion, instead of encouraging them in the most absurd and degrading superstition? It will not be pretended that the worship of one almighty Being is less proper to restrain the people in the path of their duty, or to encourage good morals than the worship of idols. But the least reflection will convince us that the fact itself is utterly incredible. There may be in China, as there are, perhaps, in all nations, various and very opposite opinions in matters of religion; but that the law or the government should authorize different and the most opposite religions for separate classes of men—one for the mechanics, and another for the magistrates—is a statement which would require very strong authority to entitle it to belief. That religion would soon lose its obligation upon the vulgar which they perceived to be universally disregarded by their superiors.

The advocates of the wisdom of the Chinese in matters of religion, appeal to evidence in support of their opinion, and tell us that the Chinese are possessed of five canonical books, or *kings*, which furnish the clearest proof of a most pure and refined theology, very different from those superstitions which they allow to be entertained and practised by the vulgar. Let us, therefore, on the supposition of these books containing the substance of their theological dogmas, examine a little into their nature and contents.

The first of these canonical books—the oldest and most respectable in point of authority—is the book or table of the Yking. This Yking, which has been held forth as a mysterious receptacle of the most profound knowledge, and is on that account allowed in China to be consulted only by the sect of the learned, is now known to be nothing else than a superstitious and childish device for fortune-telling or divination. It is a table on which there are sixty-four marks or lines, one half short and the other long, placed at regular intervals. The person who consults the Yking for divining some future event, takes a number of small pieces of rod, and throwing them down at random, observes carefully how their accidental position corresponds to the marks on the table, from which, according to certain established rules, he predicts either good or bad fortune. These rules, it is said, were laid down by the great Confucius, the chief of the Chinese philosophers—a circumstance which does not tend to increase his reputation. The Jesuit missionaries, who could not root out these prejudices, thought it their best policy to turn them to advantage; and in endeavouring to propagate the doctrines of Christianity, they pretended that Confucius had actually predicted the coming of the Messiah by this table of the Yking. This venerable table, or canonical book, is always consulted in the last resort: that is to say, when in cases of difficulty other authorities fail,

or are inapplicable, the Chinese philosophers betake themselves to augury or divination.

The next of the canonical books in point of authority is the Chouking, which is a book containing a few sublime truths, scattered amid a mass of the wildest ravings on the subjects of philosophy and morality. The Chouking represents *Tien*, or God Almighty, as a great spirit, residing in heaven, who created the world and all that it contains; who continually watches over the government of the universe; who delights in virtue and abhors vice; and who penetrates even the secrets of the heart. But the Chouking, amid these venerable truths, informs man that the surest method of discovering the will of the Supreme Being is, in all cases of difficulty, to consult the augury of the Tortoise. If the grandees, the ministers, and the people should be of one opinion, says the Chouking, and you of another, provided the judgment of the Tortoise is on your side, your counsel will succeed. Divination, in short, seems the ultimatum of the Chinese religion and philosophy. The other three *kings*, or canonical books, are equally absurd with those we have mentioned. There is an abstract of each of them to be found in Duhalde's description of China, a collection which contains the most authentic information as to everything which regards this empire; as authentic, at least, as can be obtained from the accounts of those Jesuit missionaries, who are not without reason suspected of very great exaggerations.

The morality of the Chinese has been much the subject of encomium, and it must be owned that the writings of some of their philosophers, of which we have many extracts in Duhalde's collection, contain excellent notions of the relative duties of man in every state of society. But how little do the speculative notions, or the precepts of a few philosophers, influence the practice and the manners of a people! If we believe the accounts of authors best worthy of credit, there is not, on the face of the earth, a nation

whose public manners are more depraved, nor any people in whose dealings with each other, or with strangers, there is less regard to honesty, to truth, or good faith.

In all the common intercourse of life the morals of the Chinese are beyond measure depraved. Father Amyot, who is in some respects a very high panegyrist of this nation, makes no scruple to declare that all ranks of the people have no other principles of conduct than interest and the fear of punishment. Commerce, which in other countries is carried on upon the basis of a mutual good faith between the parties contracting, proceeds in China upon this presumption, that all men are knaves and cheats. The author of the excellent narrative of Anson's 'Voyage round the World' has given a picture of the morals of the Chinese from facts incontestable, because witnessed by the whole of his crew. The imputation of fraud, treachery, and inhumanity he does not confine to the lower classes of the people, for the facts which he mentions show that even the magistrates, officers, and guardians of the laws countenance the chicanery and villany of their inferiors, and partake of their profits.

From this estimate of the genius and character of the Chinese, drawn from an examination of the state of the sciences, of the arts, of the government and laws of their empire, and of their progress in religion, philosophy, and morality, we may conclude, upon the whole, that the Chinese are a very remarkable people; that everything in China exhibits the traces of an ancient and early-civilized empire; and that in many respects the people merit the praise both of ingenuity and industry. But when the antiquity of this empire is pretended to be carried back for many thousands of years, and its history, during all that period, affirmed to be authenticated by the most incontrovertible evidence; when that people are supposed to have been for thousands of years able proficients in sciences, of which at this day they are shamefully ignorant; when

they are held out as the inventors of arts, of which they have not yet learned the most obvious uses and improvements; when a government and laws are vaunted as supremely excellent, which countenance the greatest enormities, and are insufficient to restrain the worst of crimes; and when that nation is praised for the perfection of its morality, where fraud, injustice, and inhumanity characterize the bulk of the people, and influence both their transactions with strangers and with each other, we must conclude that their panegyrists have wasted their time and talents in drawing a very false and exaggerated picture, which the evidence of a few facts totally discredits, and which, even independent of these opposing facts, could not be supported upon the basis of common probability.

About the middle of the sixteenth century, the Portuguese discovered the Japanese empire, which consists of several islands on the eastern coast of Asia, between thirty and forty degrees of north latitude. These islands form an extensive and even a polished state, which, for about a century and a half, has sequestrated itself from all connexion with foreigners, and subsists in peace, tranquillity, and splendour upon its own internal riches. This was not always the case. The character of the Japanese, active and enterprising, and at the same time of a bold, free, and open disposition, led them to encourage the resort of foreigners to their ports, and they formerly equipped fleets of their own, which traded to the neighbouring coast of China and the Philippine Islands; but the insatiable ambition of the Europeans and their destructive policy have produced that change which I mention, and secluded them for ever from any connexion with the empire of Japan.

The Spaniards, soon after they obtained the sovereignty of Portugal, availed themselves of the discovery of these islands, and began to carry on an immense trade to the coast of Japan. The Japanese were fond of this intercourse, and the emperor encouraged it.

but this favourable disposition was nothing more than an incentive to the ambition of the Spaniards to aim at the absolute sovereignty of the country. For this purpose they began by their usual mode of employing missionaries to convert the idolatrous Japanese to the Christian religion. Legions of priests were sent over, and so zealous were they in their function, that toward the end of the sixteenth century they boasted that the number of their new converts amounted to no less than six hundred thousand. The priests of the country, finding their interest daily decaying, were as zealous to preserve their ancient religion as the missionaries to destroy it. They represented the missionaries to the emperor as incendiaries, who came to sow dissensions in his dominions, and had already set the one half of his subjects at mortal enmity with the other. Political tenets, it may be believed, had mingled themselves with religious notions, and the emperor was very justly apprehensive, that this fervour shown by the Spaniards and Portuguese for the conversion of his subjects was but a preparative to their designs against the empire itself: he found it necessary, in the year 1586, to forbid the exercise of the Christian religion by a public edict, reserving still to the Spaniards and the Portuguese the liberty of a free trade in his dominions. The Spaniards were not satisfied. Some cordeliers were sent from the Philippine Islands on an embassy to the emperor, and they began to build a Christian church in his capital city of Meaco. The consequence was they were driven out by force of arms. Still, however, the indulgence of the emperor allowed these foreigners a free trade till the year 1637, when a Spanish ship happened to be taken by the Dutch, near the Cape of Good Hope, on board of which were found letters from a Portuguese officer to the court of Spain, containing the project of a conspiracy, for dethroning and putting to death the emperor of Japan and seizing the government. The Dutch were jealous of the lucrative trade

carried on by the Spaniards in this country, and immediately conveyed intelligence of this conspiracy to the court of Japan. The Portuguese officer was seized, and confessed the whole design. He was immediately put to death, and the emperor, in a solemn assembly of his nobles, pronounced an edict, forbidding, on pain of death, any of his subjects leaving the kingdom; and commanding that all the Spaniards and Portuguese should be instantly expelled from Japan; that all Christian converts should be imprisoned, and offering a very high reward for the discovery of any priest or missionary who should remain in his dominions. The Christians actually rose in arms, and were mad enough to attempt resistance, but they were overpowered and expelled to a man. The Dutch themselves, who had done the empire this essential service, shared the same fate with all other foreigners. They were even compelled to assist in carrying the emperor's edict into execution, and to employ the cannon of their own ships in bombarding a fortress, where some of the Spaniards had betaken themselves for shelter. The only favour the Dutch received was a permission to land upon one of the smallest islands of the empire, provided they agree to take an oath that they are not of the Portuguese religion, and to trample upon the cross in testimony of it. They are then permitted to exchange their commodities with the natives, but are not allowed to fix their own prices, for this must be done by the Japanese. Such, at this day, is all the intercourse the Europeans have with the empire of Japan with which, till the middle of the last century, they carried on a most lucrative and beneficial commerce.

CHAPTER XXV.

M. Bailly's Theory of the Origin of the Sciences among the Nations of Asia.

From a consideration of the manners, customs, and laws of the Chinese, and a comparison between them and the Egyptians, of whom we formerly treated at large under the period of ancient history, some learned men among the moderns have formed a conjecture that the Chinese were originally a colony of the Egyptians, and they have thus endeavoured to account for the striking similarity between them in many particulars of their manners, laws, and attainments in the sciences. But this similarity is not confined to the Egyptians and Chinese. These nations, together with the Indians, the Persians, the Babylonians, all exhibit some of the most wonderful features of coincidence; and this circumstance would, therefore, equally conclude for the common origin of all those different nations. This subject opens views of a very curious and interesting nature.

In the Memoirs of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Paris, we find an account of a dissertation read by M. de Mairan, in which that ingenious writer draws a parallel between the Egyptians and Chinese, from which he concludes, as the only means of accounting for their resemblance, that there must formerly have been a communication between these distant nations, and thinks it probable that a band of Egyptians had at some period penetrated into China.

M. de Mairan's parallel consists of the following remarkable instances of similarity, which may be classed under seven distinct heads.

First, the Egyptians and Chinese had the same fixed attachment to their ancient customs and abhorrence of innovations. Secondly, these nations were alike remarkable for the high measure of respect en-

tertained by children to their parents for the reverence bestowed on old age, and for the veneration they had for the bodies of their deceased ancestors. Thirdly, the Chinese and Egyptians were alike remarkable for their aversion to war, and deficiency in military genius; and both, in consequence, were frequently subdued by neighbouring nations. Fourthly, both were remarkable for the same general knowledge of the arts and sciences, which they carried to a certain point of advancement, but were unable to go farther. Fifthly, the Egyptians had a hieroglyphical language not representative of the language they spoke, but of ideas only. The ancient Chinese had, in like manner, a hieroglyphical language distinct from the characters they used in ordinary writing. The Japanese and the Coreans derived the use of hieroglyphics from them, and employ them at this day. Sixthly, the Egyptians had a solemn festival called the *Feast of the Lights.* The most solemn festival of the Chinese is the *Feast of the Lantern.** And in the seventh and last place, M. de Mairan remarks, that there is a similarity between the features of the Chinese and the ancient Egyptian statues.

A modern hypothesis, of a very ingenious nature, accounts not only for those remarkable circumstances of similarity between these two nations, but for many wonderful coincidences both in manners and in opinions of the Indians, the Persians, the Chaldeans, and, in short, of almost all the great nations of antiquity. The hypothesis alluded to is that of M. Bailly, author of the "History of the Ancient and Modern Astronomy" and is contained in a series of letters ad-

* The authors of the Modern Universal History most whimsically derive the origin of this festival from the number of lamps which Noah was obliged to make use of in the ark, and make this an argument in support of their hypothesis, tha Noah himself visited China, and planted there all those arts and sciences which were known to the antediluvian world — See Mod. Univ. Hist., vol. viii. p. 382.

dressed by him to M. de Voltaire, and published under the title of "Lettres sur l'Origine des Sciences et sur celles des Peuples de l'Asie." This theory is not only in itself a beautiful effort of philosophic ingenuity, but the facts by which it is supported tend to throw considerable light on the early state of the arts and sciences among the Asiatic nations.

It is the idea of M. Bailly, that there has been a very ancient people of whom every trace is now extinct; a polished people who had attained to a great degree of perfection in the arts and sciences, and to whom the Chinese, the Persians, the Chaldeans, or Babylonians, the Indians and the Egyptians, in short, all of the most ancient nations to whom historical record extends, were indebted for that measure of knowledge they possessed in those arts and sciences. "If you see," says M. Bailly, "the house of a peasant chiefly composed of the rudest materials, but here and there interspersed with fragments of sculptured stones, or pieces of elegant columns, you must, of necessity, conclude that these fragments are the remains of a palace, or elegant edifice constructed by an ancient architect of much greater skill and ability than the builder of that cottage." This principle is the foundation of M. Bailly's hypothesis.

China exhibits the traces of a perfection in the sciences, to which the present Chinese and their ancestors, for many ages, have been most signally inferior. They are possessed of astronomical instruments which they cannot use, and have no desire to be taught the use of. Science we find among the modern nations is progressive; the present age avails itself of the lights of the past. In China, all science is stationary, and has ever been so. The Chinese are at present, with respect to most of the sciences, like the inhabitants of a country recently discovered by a polished people, who have communicated some of their improvements to them, and left their instruments among them. If Captain Cook had left a quadrant and a telescope at

Otaheite, the inhabitants of that island would at present know as much of the use of those instruments as the Chinese do, who have been astronomers for two thousand years. Hence it is reasonable to infer, that the Chinese have no natural genius for those sciences; they, therefore, could not have sprung up among themselves, but must have been imported into that country from a nation which cultivated them with intelligence and success. Fohi is said to have been the instructer of the Chinese. He was therefore, probably, a foreigner, and brought his knowledge from a refined and scientific nation.

The date of the foundation of Persepolis, by Djemschid, is fixed by M. Bailly three thousand two hundred and nine years before the Christian era. The city is recorded to have been founded on the day of the sun's entry into the constellation of the Ram. A people in their infant state, uniting themselves into society, cannot be supposed to be astronomers, or to mark the foundation of their city by the stars. Djemschid was certainly the leader of a colony of a polished people who took possession of a new country, and established there the arts and sciences which they had long cultivated at home. Djemschid was a stranger in Persia, as Fohi was in China.

The commencement of the Babylonian empire is involved in obscurity. We know, however, that the king of a people at that time named Chaldeans, took Babylon two thousand and five hundred years before the Christian era. The Chaldeans were an enlightened people, and incorporating themselves completely with the conquered nation, assumed their name of Babylonians, as the Tartars, after the conquest of China, termed themselves Chinese. The priests, however, the depositaries of the sciences, kept their ancient appellation of Chaldeans, which thence became synonymous with soothsayers, or wise men. It is certain that the Chaldeans understood the revolution of comets, which was unknown to Hipparchus, to Ptolemy,

and even to all the modern world down to the days of Tycho Brahé. Nay, Cassini himself in his youth believed comets to be nothing else than meteors. Is it not natural to conclude, that those Chaldeans who brought this high degree of knowledge to Babylon, were the remains of a most ancient and most enlightened people?

The Bramins of India believe in the unity of God, and in the immortality of the soul; but along with these sublime tenets, which presuppose an enlightened and reflecting period of society, they hold a variety of the most contemptible and childish doctrines. They derived the former, we must presume, from wise instructers; the latter have been the result of their own ignorance. We discern, in all the fables of their theology, the remains of an ancient and a pure system of religious opinions, which has been corrupted by a superstitious and degraded people.

M. Bailly then reasons from the circumstance of certain singular customs and extraordinary traditions prevailing in different nations, that they must have derived them from a common source. The custom of libation to the gods was common with the Tartars and Chinese, as well as with the Greeks and Romans. All the ancient nations had feasts of the same nature with the saturnalia. The tradition of the deluge is signally diffused, and is commemorated among many nations by different religious institutions. The Egyptians held that Mercury had engraven the principles of the sciences upon brazen columns, which resisted the effects of the deluge. The Chinese have the history of Peyrun, a peculiar favourite of the gods, who was preserved in a boat from the general inundation. The Indians have a similar tradition. Vishnou, one of their gods, under the form of a fish, conducted the vessel which saved a remnant of the human species. The same tradition is to be found in the Edda of the Scandinavians; only their deluge, instead of water, is formed by the blood of a giant. The tra-

dition of the golden age, M. Bailly, with an elegant stretch of fancy, supposes to have arisen from the natural regrets expressed by the first colonies of this ancient people, when they recalled to remembrance the happy territory of their nativity, and painted it in the most flattering colours to their children. The fable of the giants attacking heaven is extremely general. The Indians and Siamese have it as well as the Greeks. The tradition of the Atlantis, a lost continent, is current among the Chinese, and among all the Asiatic nations. Plato did not invent the story, but gave it as an old tradition among the Greeks. The doctrine of the metempsychosis was part of the religion of the Egyptians, of the Bramins, and of the Persians; and the worship of the grand lama, the priest of the god Fo, in Tartary and in China, is founded upon it. Kæmpfer* shows, that the Amida, or Xaca, of the Japanese, the Fo of the Chinese, the Butta of the Indians, the Badhum of the Isle of Ceylon, the Sommona-kodom of Siam, the Sommonarhutana of Pegu, are all one and the same personage; a deity, whose sect the same author compares to the plant termed the Indian fig, which multiplies itself by the ends of the branches becoming roots. But what constitutes the strongest resemblance, and is, indeed, the point of union of all these different religions, is, that they are all founded on one very profound, though erroneous, doctrine, of the two principles, a *universal soul* pervading all nature, and *inert matter* upon which this soul exerts its influence. Bailly concludes justly, "A conformity in a true doctrine is not a convincing proof of a mutual understanding or concert; but a conformity in a false doctrine amounts to something very near such a proof."

M. Bailly then proceeds to point out many remarkable coincidences in matters respecting the sciences in all those nations we have mentioned. The Egyp-

* Hist. Gen. des Voyages, tom. xi. 265.

tians, Chaldeans, Indians, Persians, and Chinese, all placed their temples, and other public buildings, fronting exactly to the east; the buildings themselves standing due east and west. The worship of fire, or of the sun, has been the original worship of that ancient people from whom they borrowed their arts and sciences; and the temples were so placed, that the first rays of the sun might penetrate into the sanctuary. We formerly remarked the exact position of the pyramids of Egypt, with respect to the cardinal points of the horizon, and thence argued that that people must have made a very considerable advancement in astronomy before they were able thus accurately to regulate the position of those great structures. The same argument must be applied to those other nations we have mentioned, who must all have either made the same progress in the science of astronomy, or have been taught a certain rule by that more ancient nation, whom M. Bailly supposes to have been the common instructer of the whole of them.

In like manner, the Chaldeans, Egyptians, Indians, and Chinese, had all the same period of sixty years for regulating their chronology. Whether this number of years was chosen arbitrarily, or there was some reason for pitching upon it, still the coincidence is an additional proof of the general conformity. The same nations divided the circle into three hundred and sixty degrees, and the zodiac into twelve parts. The week was universally divided into seven days; and what is almost astonishing, the Chinese, the Indians, and the Egyptians, designated these days by the names of the planets, ranged precisely in the same order, which order is entirely an arbitrary one, and not dependant either on their magnitudes or distances from the sun. Chance could not have produced such wonderful coincidences.

Bailly, in his ancient astronomy, has shown that the long measures of the ancients had all one common origin. He has proved, that the circumference of the earth, as given by Ptolemy at one hundred and eighty

thousand stadia, and by Possidonius at two hundred and forty thousand stadia; that two others, one cited by Cleomedes at three hundred thousand, and the other by Aristotle at four hundred thousand stadia; together with a computation made by a Persian author, which brings the circumference of the earth to eight thousand parasangas—are all one and the same measurement, only counted by stadia of different dimensions and by parasangæ. He has shown that the Greek stadia, the Roman miles, the schæna of the Persians, the schæna of the Egyptians, the cross and the gau of the Indians, have all an exact and determined proportion to each other; that they all consist of a small measure repeated a certain number of times; and this universal and original measure M. Bailly proves to be the grand cubit which is preserved upon the Nilometer at Cairo.* All the five measurements of the earth beforementioned coincide with each other, and are the same with the measurement made by the moderns. But from all that we know of the progress of the Greeks, the Chaldeans, Indians, and Chinese, in the sciences, none of these nations were ever capable of making so exact a mensuration. He, therefore, draws the same inference as from all the other instances of agreement we have mentioned.

"These wonderful coincidences," M. Bailly concludes, "can be accounted for only by three suppositions—First, that there was an easy and free communication between all the nations of Asia; or, secondly, that the circumstances of coincidence have so essential a foundation in human nature, and in the nature of things, that nations left to themselves could not fail to have hit upon them; or, thirdly, that they have been all derived from one common source."

With regard to this first supposition, this free communication between distant nations, and interchange of ideas, of customs, of arts, and of sciences, never did

* It is twenty and a half French inches.

exist, nor ever could have existed. Human nature in all ages has been the same; and nations in every period of antiquity, as well as at this day, have manifested the strongest attachment to their own opinions, and to their own modes of thinking and of acting. Between many of the nations of Asia there was no possibility of intercourse. Distance and natural obstructions formed insuperable barriers. Many of those ancient nations had a rooted abhorrence of all strangers. The Egyptians were remarkable for this antipathy. The Chinese are known to possess it in its utmost violence at this day. Whence the conformity, then, of opinions or of arts between these two nations, separated too, as they are, by a distance of three thousand leagues?

Secondly: Those circumstances of coincidence are not such as have so essential a foundation in Nature, that nations having no intercourse must of themselves have hit upon them: in truth, many of the circumstances we have mentioned have no better foundation than the caprice of imagination, which is infinitely various. Many of those circumstances of coincidence are, as we have seen, so complicated, that an agreement of two nations by mere chance in the same thing would be nothing less than miraculous. Suppose that, in some future age, there should happen in Europe such a revolution as to destroy all the written records of the present time, and to leave nothing but a few scattered fragments, such as remain at present of the writings of the ancients. Suppose that, after an interval of many ages, a learned lawyer were to study those fragments, with a view of finding out the state of jurisprudence in Europe in the eighteenth century: he would find a number of similar laws among the Italians, the French, the Germans, &c. What must he thence conclude? He knows that those nations inhabited different countries, were under different governors, and were rivals and enemies to each other. Would it ever enter into his imagination that

they had all borrowed from each other those laws which are found to be the same? No, certainly; this would be a weak and an unphilosophical supposition. He would conclude from those resemblances that all those nations had at one period been subdued by a powerful and predominant people, who framed those laws; and that, after a time, those nations having freed themselves from the yoke of that powerful people, and established severally free governments for themselves, still chose to retain such laws as they had found by experience to be wise and salutary. This we know to be a truth with respect to the nations of Europe. But perhaps, after a period of two thousand years from this time, the certainty of this fact may be lost, and the whole become only a theory. This should be applied to the subject of which we now treat. The historical certainty is lost, the rational theory remains.

Thirdly: The only rational supposition, then, remains; viz., that there must have been a great original nation, now utterly extinct, and of whose history no document remains, who had advanced to a very high degree of perfection in the sciences and arts; who either subdued or sent colonies to the other countries of Asia; who, in fine, were their instructers, and communicated their knowledge and improvements to nations more barbarous than themselves.

It remains to determine where was the residence of this great nation; and M. Bailly has assigned many plausible reasons for placing it about the forty-ninth or fiftieth degrees of north latitude to the north of Tartary, and in the country now known by the name of Siberia. All ancient history is agreed as to the populousness of that region of the earth, and many nations at this day trace their origin from it. The Chinese assign to themselves an origin from that quarter; and so likewise, as we have formerly seen, do the Danes and other Scandinavian nations. The resemblance of the Japanese in feature and bodily figure to the

Tartars strongly marks a descent from that great parent stock. It is ingeniously remarked by Bailly, that the production of nitre is more abundant in Tartary and Siberia than in any other region of the earth. Now, nitre is produced solely from animal substances: a proof thence arises of the great population of those countries.

Other facts tend still more strongly to confirm this idea of the local situation of this ancient people. The observations of the rising of the stars collected by Ptolemy must have been made in a climate where the longest day was sixteen hours. This corresponds to the latitude of forty-nine or fifty degrees; but in the age of Ptolemy there was no nation in Europe which understood astronomy and inhabited that latitude. It must, therefore, have been an Asiatic people, inhabiting the northern parts of Tartary, or the southern regions of Siberia.

The *Zendavesta*, or the sacred book containing the religion of Zoroaster, says that the longest day of summer is double the length of the shortest day of winter; but this applies not to Persia, where Zoroaster lived, but to a climate twenty degrees to the north of Ispahan.

The measure of the circumference of the earth, as recorded by Aristotle—which, it has been already observed, could not have been computed by the Greeks, nor by any of the ancient nations known in Aristotle's time—gives the measurement of a degree precisely corresponding to its real length in the latitude of forty-nine or fifty The people, therefore, who executed that great enterprise, the exact mensuration of the earth, lived in that latitude.

The pilgrimages of the Indians to the pagod of *the Great Lama* through a vast tract of desert and inhospitable country is a singular fact, and must have had some extraordinary motive. Does it not afford room to conjecture, that the Indian religion must have originated in that quarter for which they have still so much

veneration? An Indian, who was told that the remotest nations of Europe were wont to take long pilgrimages to the distant country of Judæa, would certainly conclude with reason that that country had been the original seat of an ancient and venerable system of religion.

It affords no solid objection to this hypothesis that the country which is supposed to have been formerly so cultivated and enlightened is now inhabited by a rude and ignorant people. To have reasoned as to the ancient state of Turkey from its situation and condition at present, we could certainly never suppose that it had been the residence and native country of the polished Greeks.

One question naturally occurs from the consideration of the above arguments for the local situation of this great people. Does the country in those regions of Asia, which lie in the forty-ninth and fiftieth degrees of north latitude, exhibit, at this day, any traces of having been once inhabited by a polished people? Does it show any vestiges of their works? It is fortunate for the hypothesis of M. Bailly, that there are, though not a great many, yet some vestiges of such works. M. Pallas, who, at the command of the emperess Catharine of Russia, surveyed most minutely the extensive regions of Siberia, gives information of some discoveries in the neighbourhood of the town of Krasnojarsk, upon the banks of the great river Jeniséia, which indicate that that country had been once inhabited by a people who had made very considerable progress in the arts. Krasnojarsk is situated about the fifty-sixth degree of north latitude. There have been ancient mines discovered in that neighbourhood, which have been wrought in some former period of which there is no account or tradition. They find the instruments which have been used in mining, and which are of forms and materials which indicate great antiquity; huge hammers made of stone, and instruments like pickaxes, and wedges made of copper. In

the plains and in the mountains near the river Irtish, in the same latitude, but farther to the west, there are many ancient burying-places, in which they find knives, daggers, and points of arrows made of copper. In other burying-places, near Krasnojarsk, they have found ornaments of copper and of gold; some of them adorned with embossed figures of various animals, elks, raindeers, stags, etc., all of exquisite workmanship. There is a curious circumstance which evidences the prodigious antiquity of those mines we have mentioned. The props which support the earth in those mines are now petrified, and this petrifaction contains sometimes copper and gold. So much time, therefore, has elapsed since those props were erected, that nature has gone through the tedious process of forming those metals; and the same course of time has entirely annihilated every vestige of the stones with which the same men who dug those mines must have built their houses: for in a period of society when men are arrived at the art of forming curious works in gold and copper, we must suppose they dwelt in towns, and could rear regular edifices; but of such towns and edifices not a trace remains.

Such is the ingenious hypothesis of M. Bailly, and thus far his theory has no small share of plausibility: but when he goes on afterward to find the history of this great nation in the Atalantis of the ancients, described by Plato, and supposes the first population of the earth to have been at the north pole, he is plainly launching into the region of imagination. It is altogether a very amusing specimen of philosophic ingenuity, but is more valuable as specifying many curious facts relative to the manners and attainments of the ancient nations, and as furnishing strong evidence of the common origin of mankind, than as affording any plausible grounds for fixing the locality of this primeval people.

CHAPTER XXVI.

REIGN OF PHILIP II. OF SPAIN—REVOLUTION OF THE NETHERLANDS, AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF HOLLAND:—William of Nassau declared Stadtholder of the United Provinces—Philip acquires the Sovereignty of Portugal—Schemes against England—Defeat of the Armada—Death and Character of Philip II.

FROM our rapid review of the state of the Asiatic kingdoms, we now return to consider the situation of Europe toward the middle of the sixteenth century.

In the time of Philip II. of Spain, the successor of Charles V., the balance of power in Europe was maintained by four great monarchies. Spain sustained its part by the talents of its monarch and his vast resources in point of wealth, derived from the treasures of the new world; France, by its internal strength and situation; Germany, by the power and abilities of many of its princes, who, though jealous of each other, were united for the defence of their country; and England, by the great political genius and wisdom of Queen Elizabeth and her ministers. Of these, perhaps, Philip of Spain acted the principal character, though not the most amiable or respectable. He was, in his temper, selfish, gloomy, overbearing, and tyrannical. Yet he possessed great political activity, indefatigable assiduity in the management of public affairs, and a consummate ability in securing his own kingdom from danger by fomenting divisions among all his neighbours. He was at this time sovereign of Spain, of the Milanese, of the two Sicilies, and of all the Netherlands; and his father, Charles V., had left him an army of the best disciplined troops in Europe. He had, likewise, in the beginning of his reign, the whole force of England under his command, from his marriage with Queen Mary.

Pope Paul IV., jealous of this exorbitant power, took advantage of the hereditary passion of the French

monarchs to establish themselves in Italy, and formed an alliance with Henry II. of France to deprive the Spaniards of some important branches of their huge empire. A war was therefore declared between France and Spain, of which the object and the prize was the sovereignty of Milan and the Sicilys. The Spaniards began their attack on the French on the quarter of Flanders. Philip, with the assistance of eight thousand English, engaged the French at St. Quintin, in Picardy, and gained a most complete and glorious victory. The French lost almost the whole of their general officers and the flower of their nobility. This victory was followed by the taking of the town of St. Quintin; but Philip, who had greater abilities in negotiating than in fighting, gave his enemy time to recover strength while he was meditating to secure these important advantages by a peace. The duke of Guise, whom Henry II. had appointed generalissimo of all the forces of his kingdom, recovered for a while the spirits of the French, by the taking of Calais and the total expulsion of the English, who had now possessed it above two hundred years. But in the meantime the troops of Philip gained another battle in the neighbourhood of Gravelines, in which Count Egmont, the Spanish general, completely defeated the French under the Marshal de Ternis. This appeared to Philip a favourable juncture for making peace with the greatest advantage: the treaty of Chateau Cambrésis was accordingly concluded between Spain and France, in the year 1559, extremely advantageous for Spain, as the French, mortified by their losses, gave up no less than eighty-nine fortified towns in the Low Countries and in Italy. Philip likewise, assuming all the authority of a conqueror, caused the territory of Bouillon to be restored to the bishop of Liege; Montferat to the duke of Mantua; Corsica to the Genoese; and Savoy, Piedmont, and Bresse to the duke of Savoy. Henry II. was likewise, at the same time, obliged to conclude a peace with Elizabeth of England, of which one con-

dition was, the redelivery of Calais, which Henry agreed to restore within eight years, or to pay five hundred thousand crowns; but Calais was never restored, nor was the money ever paid. Philip cemented this peace by marrying Elizabeth, the daughter of Henry II. This princess, it is said, had been promised in marriage to his son Don Carlos, a circumstance on which some writers have founded a most romantic story of distress, and which is said to have been the cause of that deplorable catastrophe which, as we shall afterward see, befell both the unfortunate prince and the queen, his mother-in-law.

Philip returned in triumph to Spain, where his active mind, now at ease from foreign disturbances, began to be disquieted on the score of religion, and he laid down a fixed resolution to extirpate every species of heresy from his dominions. The inquisition was invested with all the plenitude of the powers of persecution. It is wonderful how much the spirit of this tyrant coincided with that of his consort Mary of England; only Mary burnt the protestants at once, and Philip prepared them for that ceremony by racks and tortures. The king of Spain, hearing that there were some heretics in a valley of Piedmont, bordering on the Milanese, sent orders to the governor of Milan to despatch a few troops that way, and concluded his order in two remarkable words, "*ahorcad todos*"—hang them all. Being informed that the same opinions were entertained by some of the inhabitants of Calabria, he ordered one half to be *hanged* and the other *burnt*; the consequences of these cruelties were what he did not foresee, the loss of a third part of his dominions.

The Netherlands were an assemblage of seignories or lordships, subject to Philip II. under various titles. Each province had its particular laws and usages, and was under the command of a governor, who had the title of Stadtholder; and no law was enacted, or taxes imposed without the sanction of the whole

States in the district. In the year 1559, Philip conferred the government of Holland, Zealand, Friesland, and Utrecht, on William of Nassau, prince of Orange, who was also a count of the German empire.

The new opinions of Calvin and of Luther, which had made great progress in the Netherlands, gave Philip much disquiet. He determined to create new bishops, to establish the Inquisition with its amplest powers, and, in order to enforce the most implicit submission to his authority, he resolved to abrogate all the ancient laws of the provinces, and give them a political system of his own devising. The report of these innovations created a dreadful alarm, and a meeting was held of the chief lords of the Netherlands, who deputed two of their number to lay their humble remonstrances before the king at Madrid. The effect which this produced was, that the duke of Alva was immediately sent into Flanders to suppress what was termed an unnatural rebellion; but there had been no *rebellion* if this measure had not occasioned one.

William I., prince of Orange, was a man of a haughty, reserved, and resolute turn of mind. He had seen several of the nobility, his friends, the counts Egmont and Horn, with eighteen other gentlemen, beheaded on account of their religion by sentence of the Inquisition at Brussels; and the prince himself was sentenced to undergo the same fate, as a Calvinist and heretic. In the prospect of this impending destruction, he conceived the magnanimous resolution of delivering his country from the yoke of its merciless tyrant, and confident that the great body of the people were kept in their allegiance to the Spanish government only from the principle of fear, which would be dissipated on the first dawning of success, he immediately began to collect an army. In a short time, having reduced some of the most important garrisons in Holland and in Zealand, he was solemnly proclaimed Stadtholder of the United Prov-

inces by a general convocation at the States of Dort, who, at the same time, openly threw down the gauntlet of defiance to Philip II. by declaring that the Romish religion should for ever be abolished from these provinces. Hostilities began on the part of Philip, by laying siege to the rebellious city of Haerlem; and the town being at length compelled to surrender, the whole magistrates, all the Protestant ministers, and above fifteen hundred of the citizens, were hanged. Philip's viceroy, the duke of Alva, who at this time resigned his government, boasted, that, during the period of his administration, he had put eighteen thousand persons to death by the hands of the public executioner. His successor followed the same plan which had been prescribed by his tyrannical master. The Spaniards besieged Leyden, which was most resolutely defended by the prince of Orange. The Dutch threw down the dikes which restrained the encroachments of the sea, and the whole country was laid under water; and what was equally singular, as an effort of vigorous perseverance, the Spaniards continued the siege, and attempted to drain off the inundation. But the Dutch compelled them, at length, to abandon the undertaking. The whole seventeen provinces had suffered equally from the harassing of their sovereign: but jealousy of the power of the prince of Orange prevented a general union, and only seven of these asserted their independence.

Philip now sent his brother, the celebrated Don John of Austria, whom we have seen victorious over the Turks at Lepanto, to endeavour to regain the revolted Netherlands; but the attempt was fruitless. The prince of Orange summoning a meeting of the provinces at Utrecht, a treaty of union was formed, which became the foundation of the commonwealth of Holland. It was agreed, by this treaty, that they should defend each other as one body; that they should consult concerning peace and war; establish a legislative authority; regulate the imposition of taxes: and

maintain a liberty of conscience in matters of religion. These *Seven United Provinces* were Guelderland, Holland, Zealand, Friesland, Utrecht, Overyssel, and Groningen. They chose William prince of Orange to be their head, with the authority of general of their armies, admiral of their fleets, and chief magistrate by the name of Stadtholder. This famous treaty bears date the 23d January, 1579.

The intelligence of these proceedings exasperated Philip in the most extreme degree. He proscribed the prince of Orange, and set the price of twenty-five thousand crowns upon his head. William, in his answer, which is one of the finest things recorded in history, considers himself as on a level with the king of Spain; impeaches him for injustice, perfidy, and tyranny at the tribunal of all Europe; and declares, for his own part, that though he might imitate the conduct of Philip by proscribing him in his turn, he abhorred the base revenge, and rested his security upon the point of his sword.

Philip, however, compassed his vengeance against the prince of Orange; the reward had its effect, and repeated attempts were made against the life of this illustrious man. At length, one Gérard, a native of Franche-compté, put him to death by assassination. Maurice, the son of William, was declared stadtholder in room of his father; and, though only eighteen years of age, showed himself worthy of that important trust, and approved himself one of the ablest generals of his time. His military talents had the noblest field for their exertion, as his antagonist, Alexander duke of Parma, then lieutenant to Philip in the Netherlands, was deservedly ranked among the greatest captains in Europe. The siege of Antwerp has immortalized his memory as well as that of its brave defenders. After a most heroic resistance, it was at length taken by the duke of Parma, by means of an immense rampart which he raised upon the river

Scheld, in the same manner as the city of Tyre had been taken by Alexander the Great.

To protect this infant protestant state, Queen Elizabeth sent the stadtholder four thousand men, under the command of the earl of Leicester; and with this timely assistance, and their own internal resources, the Hollanders were enabled to struggle against the force of the most powerful monarch in Europe. They maintained their independence as the ancient Lacedæmonians had done, by simplicity of manners, public frugality, and the most invincible courage. The simplicity of those times, when the Hollanders lived in clusters of small huts upon the banks of their canals, is very different from their present mode of life, when Amsterdam has become one of the richest of the cities of Europe, and the Hague one of the most polished and luxurious.

The government of the United Provinces was a very curious political structure. Of seventeen provinces of the Netherlands, we have seen that seven only recovered their liberty; the rest, under the governance of the duke of Anjou, a man jealous of the prince of Orange, to whom he was greatly inferior in abilities, contented themselves with repining and murmuring at those grievances which had made their neighbours resolutely withdraw their necks from the yoke. They flattered themselves that they could secure their liberty by negotiations; and the court of Madrid, in order to sooth them, gave them a charter, confirming their privileges, while, at the same time, it was taking effectual measures to prevent all future attempts that might be made to reclaim and vindicate them. The revolted provinces, we have observed, signed their treaty of union on the 23d of January, 1579, and this alliance, which was renewed in 1583, was by its nature, indissolute: it was the foundation of the whole structure of the republic. Each of the United Provinces preserved its own laws, its magistrates, its independence and its sovereignty; but for *national* purposes

they were to form one body; and, in order to complete a union of interests, they renounced the right of forming separate alliances, and established a general council, whose business was to regulate the common affairs of the republic, and to convocate the states-general, a meeting which originally was called only twice a year, but which the great variety and importance of their business soon rendered perpetual.

Strictly speaking, each of the towns, which had a right of sending its deputy to the particular assembly of the province, constituted in itself a republic. Excepting those matters which respected the general interest of the states, these towns were governed by their own laws and magistrates, and their senate possessed a supreme legislature and executive authority. But all the towns of the same province were obliged to form a general council to regulate the affairs of the province, and to serve as a bond of union between its several parts. This council possessed a power of deliberating on all matters which respect the interest of the provinces; and the deputies of the towns which formed this council communicated to their constituents intelligence of all those matters which were there to be agitated, and received their instructions, which they were bound to follow. Everything was decided in the council of the province by the votes of the majority, unless such questions as regard peace and war, the levying of troops, the forming of alliances, and the establishment of general taxes; all which matters required, by the fundamental treaty of union, the unanimous consent of the assembly of the states-general.

The great national council, or the states-general, met in assembly at the Hague, and were composed of the deputies from the seven provinces—Holland sending three, Zealand and Utrecht two, and the others one; and these had their conduct regulated by the instructions which each deputy received from the council of his province. The majority of suffrages was deci-

sive here as in the provincial assemblies, except in those great questions which we have mentioned regarding war and peace, alliances or general taxes, where unanimity was required.

One obvious disadvantage attending such a constitution was, the delays and difficulties that may retard the execution of any public measure, from the necessity which the deputies or representatives, both in the assembly of the states and in the provincial council, were under of consulting their constituents upon all matters that came before them, and being regulated entirely by their direction. Fifty towns, and all the nobles of the province, must deliberate on any piece of business; and each provincial assembly must come to a fixed resolution, so as to instruct its deputy, before the assembly of the states-general was qualified to take the matter under consideration. The faultiness of such a constitution, which deprived a state of all possibility of acting with celerity in emergencies where success, perhaps, depended on celerity, needs no illustration. A government could not long have subsisted were there was so capital and radical an error, had not a contracting principle been applied in the office and power of the stadtholder.

The powers and prerogatives of the stadtholder were very great; he was commander-in-chief both of the sea and land forces, and disposed of all the military employments; he presided over all the courts of justice: he had the power of pardoning criminals, and all sentences were pronounced in his name; he appointed the magistrates of the towns, from a list of a certain number presented by themselves; he gave audience to ambassadors and foreign ministers, and nominated his envoys to foreign states; he was charged with the execution of all the decrees of the provincial assemblies; he was arbiter and supreme judge, without appeal, in all the differences between the provinces, and between the cities and the other members of the state.

The most extensive powers were conferred upon the first stadtholder of the united states, William I. prince of Orange, and they were not abused; on the contrary, they counterbalanced, in his hands, all the defects of this new constitution. Maurice, like his father, used his power as a good citizen, zealous for the honour of his country. His brother, Frederic-Henry, conducted himself on the same principles; but his son William II., who succeeded to this dignity in the year 1647, was believed to have views not equally beneficial to the republic. Whether it was that the provinces, after having concluded the definite peace of Munster with Spain, thought that they had less occasion for the office of stadtholder, and began to fear the immense power of that magistrate, or that William became more jealous of his authority in proportion as he saw that it was less necessary, it is certain there was no longer the same good understanding between the states and the stadtholder; and had it not been for the death of William, this discordance might have ended fatally for the constitution. The most zealous patriots, to prevent the like apprehensions, took measures at that time for depriving his posthumous son, William III., of the succession to his father's dignities; but the evils resulting from the want of this office were severely felt in that emergency, when in the reign of Louis XIV. the whole power of France and her allies threatened the total annihilation of the republic. The abilities of William III., rendered him worthy to supply his father's place, and he was no sooner established in it than he retrieved the fortunes of his country. In grateful acknowledgment of his services, the united provinces not only granted that dignity to him for life, but made it hereditary to the heirs-male of his family.

This last was an error equally pernicious with that of abolishing the office altogether; for it is easy to see that those immense powers, though they might be beneficial in the person of a *temporary* magistrate,

were extremely dangerous when the office became perpetual and hereditary. It happened, indeed, that William had no children, and the error at his death might again have been remedied, but the patriots a second time pushed matters too far on the opposite side. They revived the laws which proscribed the office of stadtholder, and for above twenty years there was no such magistrate. Guelderland, however, in the year 1722, elected the Prince of Orange of the second branch of the house of Nassau; and about twenty years after, when attacked by France, the rest of the states saw the necessity of reviving the office, and the same prince was nominated Stadtholder of the United Provinces. Ever in extremes, and blind to the real nature of their own constitution, the Dutch were now not contented with making this dignity again hereditary; they even made it descendible to daughters. It was decreed by the last deed of election, that the office should never descend to any prince who enjoyed the dignity of king or of elector of the German empire, or who should not be of the protestant religion. It was stated, likewise, that the stadtholders should be educated during their minority in the united provinces, and that the office should descend to the posterity of the princesses of Orange, *only* in case they have married with the consent of the states, a protestant prince neither king nor elector.

To console Philip for the loss of the Netherlands, he soon after gained the kingdom of Portugal. Muley Mahomet, king of Fez and Morocco, had offered to become Philip's tributary, on condition of obtaining his assistance against Muley Moluc, his uncle, who had expelled him from his kingdom. Philip refused it, and the Moor then solicited the aid of Don Sebastian, the young monarch of Portugal. This prince embarked immediately for Africa, impatient to display his military prowess; but the event was fatal, for in one single engagement both he himself and the two contending kings, Muley Mahomet and Muley Moluc,

lost their lives. This Muley Moluc was a prince who, in some circumstances of character, was equal to the greatest heroes of ancient Greece or Rome. There does not exist in history a nobler instance of intrepidity or greatness of soul than what this man exhibited in his dying moments, in that remarkable engagement. Moluc was in full possession of the empire of Morocco at the time when his dominions were invaded by Don Sebastian; but he was fast consuming with a distemper which he knew to be incurable. He prepared, however, for the reception of so formidable an enemy. He was indeed reduced to such weakness of body, that, on the day when the last decisive battle was to be fought, he did not expect to live so long as to know the fate of the engagement. He planned himself the order of battle, and being carried on a litter through the ranks, endeavoured by his voice and gesture to animate his troops to the utmost exertions of courage. Conscious that the fate of his family and of his kingdom depended upon the issue of that day, he gave orders to his principal officers, that if he died during the engagement, they should conceal his death from the army, and that they should, from time to time, ride up to the litter in which he was carried, under pretence of receiving orders from him as usual. When the battle had continued for some time, Muley Moluc perceived with great anguish of mind that his troops in one quarter began to give way. He was then near his last agonies; but, collecting what remained of strength and life, he threw himself out of the litter, rallied his army, and again led them on to the charge. Quite exhausted, he fell down on the field, and, being carried back to his litter, he laid his finger on his mouth to enjoin secrecy to his officers who stood around him, and expired a few moments after in that posture.

The victory, dearly purchased by the loss of this heroic man, was complete upon the part of the Moors. The adventurous Don Sebastian was killed in the bat-

tle, and was succeeded in the throne of Portugal by his great uncle Don Henry; but *he* was at that time on the verge of the grave, and survived his predecessor only two years. The competitors for the crown at his decease were, Don Antonio, the prior of Crato, uncle to the last monarch by the father's side; Philip, king of Spain, his uncle by the mother's side; and pope Gregory XIII., on the absurd pretence that one of his predecessors had bestowed the crown on one of the former kings, who engaged to become his feudatory. The right of Philip was supported by twenty thousand men. Antonio, the prior of Crato, solicited the aid of Queen Elizabeth, who, though she cordially hated Philip, did not at that time find it convenient to declare war against Spain; but the prior obtained very effectual assistance from the French, who lent him sixty ships and six thousand men. The fleet of Philip, however, infinitely superior to that of his competitor, gave him a decided victory. Don Antonio's pretensions were set aside by one naval engagement, and the unfortunate prior betook himself to the court of France, where he passed his days in a state of honourable dependance; while Philip, without opposition from his holiness of Rome, was crowned king of Portugal.

The arms of this powerful monarch, while they were employed in a vigorous but ineffectual struggle to recover his revolted provinces of the Netherlands, were now turned toward another object, a war with Queen Elizabeth, who openly espoused the cause of the Hollanders, and had, besides, by one of her admirals, Sir Francis Drake, taken and plundered some of the Spanish settlements in America. To revenge these injuries, Philip prepared for an invasion of the kingdom of England, and equipped the Invincible Armada, the most formidable naval armament that had ever been raised by any single nation. This immense armament consisted of one hundred and fifty large ships-of-war, manned by twenty thousand soldiers and upward of

eight thousand seamen, besides two thousand galley-slaves, and armed with three thousand pieces of cannon. To co-operate with this prodigious naval force, thirty thousand men were to be conveyed in transports from Flanders, and a general insurrection was expected of all the Catholics in Britain to depose Elizabeth, and place her cousin Mary of Scotland upon the throne of England. The policy and vigour of Elizabeth and her ministers, who had abundant warning of these hostile preparations, were exerted in putting the kingdom into the most formidable state of defence. Lords lieutenants were appointed in each county to muster and arm all who were capable of serving in the field;*

* Arrayed in a military dress, this heroic queen repaired to the camp of Tilbury, and addressed her army in the following most memorable speech:—

"My loving people, we have been persuaded by some that are careful of our safety to take heed how we commit ourselves to armed multitudes, for fear of treachery; but I assure you I do not desire to live to distrust my faithful and loving people. Let tyrants fear; I have always so behaved myself, that under God, I have placed my chiefest strength and safeguard in the loyal hearts and good will of my subjects. And therefore I am come among you at this time, not as for my recreation or sport, but being resolved in the midst and heat of the battle to live or die among you all; to lay down for my God, and for my kingdom, and for my people, my honour, and my blood, even in the dust. I know I have but the body of a weak and feeble woman, but I have the heart of a king, and of a king of England too; and think foul scorn that Parma or Spain, or any prince of Europe, should dare to invade the borders of my realms: to which, rather than any dishonour should grow by me, I myself will take up arms; I myself wil be your general, judge, and rewarder of your virtues in the field. I know already by your forwardness, that you have deserved rewards and crowns; and we do assure you, on the word of a prince, they shall be duly paid you. In the meantime, my lieutenant general shall be in my stead, than whom never prince commanded a more noble or worthy subject (the Earl of Leicester;) not doubting, by your obedience to my general, by your concord in the camp, and your valour in the field, we shall shortly have a famous victory over those enemies of my God, of my kingdom, and of my people."

and the maritime counties, where a landing was chiefly apprehended, were strengthened by large bodies of troops, drawn from the remote quarters of the kingdom, and every measure adopted which could either guard against a disembarkment or impede the enemy's progress and cut them off, if the landing was actually accomplished. On the 20th of May, 1588, the Spanish fleet, commanded by the Duke de Medina Sidonia, set sail from Lisbon, but were forced by stress of weather to put into Corunna, which they did not leave till the 22d of July.

This vast project was dissipated like a summer's cloud. The English met the Invincible Armada with one hundred ships of a smaller size and eighty fire-ships. The fire-ships attacked them in the night, which threw them into the utmost confusion; an engagement ensued in which the English were favoured by a storm, which drove the Spaniards upon the coast of Zealand; many of their vessels were taken, a great number beaten to pieces upon the rocks and sand-banks, and only fifty ships with about six thousand men of all this prodigious armament returned to Spain. When intelligence of this great national misfortune arrived at Madrid, the behaviour of Philip upon that occasion was, it must be owned, truly magnanimous. "*God's holy will be done*," said he: "*I thought myself a match for the power of England, but I did not pretend to fight against the elements.*" Beautiful, just, and moral is the short reflection of Bentivoglio upon this signal catastrophe. "Such," says he, "was the fate of the memorable armada of Spain, which threatened the demolition of the power of England: few enterprises were ever more deeply weighed, few preceded by more immense preparations, and none perhaps ever attended with a more unfortunate issue. How vain and fallacious are the best-concerted schemes of man! Thus often the Divine Providence, in the wisdom of his impenetrable decrees, has determined

the fate of an enterprise quite contrary to the presumptuous expectations of human foresight."*

Philip, who had always several projects on foot at the same time (and perhaps this was the greatest error of his policy,) was meditating at once the invasion and conquest of England, the reduction of the Netherlands, and the dismemberment of the kingdom of France. We have seen the issue of the first of these projects: the second, though not equally disastrous, fell equally short of its aim; and in the last, he did no more than foment disturbances which civil discord had already excited, and which in the end procured to him no advantage whatever. Every prospect of his ambition in France was demolished by a single stroke, the conversion of Henry IV. to the catholic religion. The character of Philip II. was that of a turbulent and most ambitious spirit: his was a crafty system of policy, in which there was nothing either great or generous. He was a man fitted to harass and embroil Europe, without that soundness of judgment even to turn the distresses which he occasioned to his substantial advantage. In his own kingdoms he was a cruel, a gloomy, and an inhuman tyrant; in his family, a harsh and suspicious master, a barbarous husband, and an unnatural father. In the last of these characters, he signalized himself by the murder of his queen and of his son, the unfortunate Don Carlos, whose fate, according to the common accounts, is so extraordinary as to wear the air of a romance, though the truth of the principal facts has never been disputed. There is nothing improbable in the circumstance that this unfortunate prince should conceive an involuntary passion for his mother-in-law, a beautiful princess of equal age with himself, or that she, who could have no affection for a husband of Philip's disposition, should feel a similar attachment. Popular belief does justice to these ill-fated lovers in denying that they ever had

* Bentivoglio Guerra di Fiandra, lib. iv.

a more guilty connexion. A disappointed female favourite, for whom Carlos had formerly professed a partial affection, is said, from jealousy and revenge, to have discovered to Philip their correspondence. He seized on the prince's papers, among which, it is said, were found some passionate letters from the queen, as well as a treasonable correspondence with the stadtholder to dethrone his father. As these transactions were veiled in the most profound secrecy, which none of the Spanish historians have ever attempted to penetrate, it is not known whether Don Carlos underwent a trial for his crimes, or was put to death by the royal mandate alone. It is said that he had the choice of his death, and that his veins being opened, he died in the bath, while he held in his hand the picture of his mother-in-law Elizabeth. This unhappy princess, then pregnant by her husband, to whose bed she had never been unfaithful, was soon after poisoned in a medicine which she took by the command of the tyrant himself. These atrocious facts have never, it is true, been verified by authentic evidence; but it is equally true that these accusations were brought against Philip by the prince of Orange* in the face of all Europe, and that they were never refuted.

* See Apology or Defence of the Prince of Orange against the Proscription of the King of Spain.

CHAPTER XXVII.

STATE OF FRANCE IN THE END OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY: —Religious Contentions—Conspiracy of Amboise—Death of Francis II.—Charles IX.—Massacre of St. Bartholomew —Henry III.—League of Peronne—Assassination of Henry III.—Henry of Navarre abjures the Protestant Faith, and is crowned in 1594—State of France—Character of Henry IV.—His Assassination in 1610.

WHILE the Spanish monarch was possessed of so high a degree of power under Philip II. as to alarm all Europe, France was in a declining situation, divided into factions, embroiled with civil wars, and torn to pieces both by its own subjects and the ambitious designs of its neighbours. These distresses arose from religious differences, from the want of good laws, and the mal-administration of its sovereigns.

The doctrine of the reformed religion had made considerable progress in some of the provinces of France, and the persecution of the Calvinists had contributed greatly to the propagation of their opinions. The reign of Henry II., and the jealousy of his catholic clergy, had raised such a spirit of persecution, as to drive those unhappy men who would otherwise have been good subjects into an open rebellion.

The death of Henry II., and the accession of Francis II., was the era of those civil commotions which embroiled France for above thirty years, and brought that kingdom to the brink of ruin. The princes of Lorraine, or the family of the Guises, had established themselves in high credit during the two preceding reigns at the court of France. In the reign of Henry II., they had brought about the marriage of the Dauphin, now Francis II., with their niece Mary queen of Scots, whose mother was a daughter of the duke of Guise. This match gave them such an ascendancy over the young Francis, that, in fact they ruled the kingdom. In this character it may be supposed they

had powerful enemies. The two first princes of the blood, Antony of Bourbon, king of Navarre, and his brother Louis, prince of Condé, together with the constable Montmorency, were possessed of a similar ambition to that of the Guises; they were mortified by their arrogance, and were, therefore, their determined enemies. The Guises were zealots in point of religion, and intolerant catholics: the opposite party favoured the doctrines of the Reformation, which had now made considerable progress among the French. Ambition, therefore, and religion co-operating together, set the whole kingdom in a flame. A conspiracy was formed by the Huguenots, at the head of whom was the prince of Condé, with the determined purpose of wresting the government out of the hands of the duke of Guise and his family. The Huguenot conspirators agreed to meet upon a certain day at the town of Amboise, and to open the enterprise by the massacre of the Guises, and by seizing the person of the king. It was discovered by one of the conspirators almost at the moment of its execution. Fifteen thousand troops, which the duke of Guise found means to assemble, cut to pieces the forces of the conspirators as they came in detached parties to the place of rendezvous: many of them sacrificed their lives with the most desperate courage; the rest were taken and executed on scaffolds and gibbets.

The tyranny of the Guises, which increased from the demolition of this conspiracy, procured them more enemies than ever; yet so formidable was their power, that for some time it repressed all opposition. The party of the prince of Condé and the Huguenots were forced to dissemble their mortification, and to affect a placid acquiesence in the government of the Guises. The prince of Condé had the imprudence to come to court; he was immediately seized by order of the duke of Guise, brought to trial for his concern in the conspiracy of Amboise, and condemned to be beheaded. His life, however, was saved by the death of the

young monarch Francis II., and the consequent disturbances in the kingdom. Charles IX., (the brother of Francis), then a boy of ten years of age, was committed to the guardianship of the queen mother, Catharine de Medicis, on whom the states conferred, likewise, the administration of the kingdom. The court was a scene of faction and division, as well as the kingdom: the queen was equally afraid of the power of the Guises and the Condés; she was, therefore, obliged to negotiate between the protestants and catholics, and for that purpose appointed a solemn conference at Poissy, to debate on the articles of religion. The pope sent thither his legate to maintain his interest, or rather to crush all disputes, by declaring the assembly illegal as not convened by himself. His remonstrance, however, was disregarded, the conference was held, and the issue was an edict of pacification, by which the protestants were permitted the exercise of their religion through all France, without the walls of the towns. The consequence of this edict was a civil war. The duke of Guise, the head of the catholic party, met with a few protestants upon the borders of Champagne, who, under the sanction of the edict, were assembled in a barn for the purpose of devotion. His servants broke up the meeting, killed about sixty men, and dispersed and wounded the rest. This inhumanity was the signal of an insurrection through the whole kingdom, which was divided between the parties of the prince of Condé and the duke of Guise, the protestants and the catholics.

Philip II., king of Spain, to increase the commotions, sent some thousands of men to the aid of the catholics. The Guises were successful at the battle of Druex, where the constable Montmorency, who commanded the royal army, and the prince of Condé were both taken prisoners. Guise, after this victory, laid siege to Orleans, where he fell by the hands of an assassin, who accused the heads of the protestant party as having instigated him to the murder, an accusation

which was not generally believed, as it touched the admiral de Coligni, one of the chief supporters of that party, whose excellent character put him far above the suspicion of so vile a piece of treachery. A short peace succeeded these disturbances, and Condé was reconciled to the court; but the admiral kept still at the head of a considerable party in the provinces The king, who had now attained his fourteenth year had scarcely assumed the reins of government, when the prince of Condé, who had before attempted to take his predecessor, Francis, out of the hands of the Guises at Amboise, made a similar attempt to rescue Charles IX. from the leading-strings of the constable de Montmorency. The war was of consequence renewed and Condé and Coligni engaging the army of the constable at St. Denis, the catholic party was defeated and Montmorency killed. The party of the protestants was now increased by the aid of ten thousand Germans from the palatinate; yet the catholics continued the war with increased obstinacy and resolution, and France was a scene of massacre and desolation. The army of the catholics, which, on Montmorency's death, was now commanded by the king's brother, the duke of Anjou, was victorious in its turn. The prince of Condé was killed in a skirmish after the battle of Jarnac, and Coligni now supported alone the party of the Huguenots. A peace, however, was concluded between the two parties; and France had just begun to repair her losses and disasters, when a most infernal scheme was formed by the catholics for the destruction of all the protestants in France, a measure, perhaps, unparalelled in the annals of human nature, and which excited the horror and detestation of all the kingdoms of Europe. This was the massacre termed of St. Bartholomew.

The plot was laid with a dissimulation equal to the atrociousness of the design. The queen-mother, Catharine de Medicis, a most flagitious woman, had always expressed her hatred of the protestant party,

though she had at times shown a personal favour for some of its chief supporters. Her son, Charles IX., a coward in his disposition, was a monster of cruelty in his heart. It was concerted between the mother and her son, that the leaders of the protestant party should be brought to court and taken off their guard by extraordinary marks of favour and attention. Charles had given his sister Margaret in marriage to young Henry of Navarre; and he, together with the admiral Coligni and his friends, were entertained at court with every demonstration of kindness and respect. On the 24th of August, 1572, in the night, and at the ringing of the bell for matins, a general massacre was made by the Catholics of all the protestants throughout the kingdom of France. The circumstances of this abominable tragedy are too shocking to be narrated in detail. One half of the nation, with the sword in one hand and the crucifix in the other, fell with the fury of wild beasts upon their unarmed and defenceless brethren. The king himself was seen firing with a musket from a window of his palace upon those unhappy wretches who escaped into the streets naked from their beds, and endeavoured to save themselves by flight.* Father Daniel informs us, that when the news of this massacre was brought to Rome, the pope highly commended the zeal of this young monarch, and the exemplary punishment which he had inflicted on the heretics. It was no wonder, then, that the parliament of Paris decreed an annual procession on St. Bartholomew's day to offer up thanks to God, or that such was the savage fury of this nation, blinded by fanaticism, that they were not satisfied even with the death of Coligni, who fell with his brethren in that massacre, but ordered him to be executed afterward in effigy.

* This dreadful massacre was general through the kingdom of France, except in a few of the provinces, which were saved by the humanity and courage of their governors

In the midst of these calamities the throne of Poland became vacant, and the duke of Anjou was chosen king by the assembled states of the kingdom. He accepted the honours conferred on him with some reluctance, and had but just taken possession of his kingdom when he was called to that of France, by the sudden death of his brother, the execrable Charles IX. He set out for Paris without hesitation, and left the Poles, indignant at his departure, to choose for themselves another sovereign. France, at this time, exhibited a very extraordinary scene; a court involved in every species of luxury and debauchery, and a kingdom groaning under all the miseries which two factions could occasion, exasperated against each other beyond hope of reconciliation. Henry III., the new monarch, neither knew how to keep the protestants within due bounds, nor to content the catholics. He had neither abilities to manage his finances, nor to discipline his army. His debaucheries formed an extraordinary contrast to the superstition of his character, and both brought him into universal contempt. The duke of Guise obtained from him the command of his armies, and it was the interest of this prince to increase the confusions of the kingdom, that the court might always stand in need of his assistance.

In the meantime, young Henry of Navarre, brother-in-law to the French monarch, a youth of a noble spirit, who had escaped from the massacre of St. Bartholomew by going to mass with the catholics, had retired to the province of Guienne. The prince Condé, the head of the protestants, had invited the Germans into Champagne, and their party was joined by the duke of Anjou, the king's brother. The abject monarch, terrified by this association, concluded a treaty with the protestants, which exasperated his catholic subjects, while it served only to give vigour and spirits to the opposite party. It was this treaty which determined the catholics to form themselves into a league, of which the pretext was the defence of reli-

gion, of the king, and of the liberty of the state. They pitched upon the duke of Guise for their leader, who equalled his father in abilities, and was a man of yet greater ambition. The league was solemnly signed at Peronne, and acceded to through the whole of the province of Picardy. The other provinces very soon concurred. The king, who now, with some justice, apprehended more danger from *this* association, nominally formed for his defence, than from all the designs of the protestants, thought to perform a masterly stroke of policy by signing the league himself, which he imagined would give him the absolute command of the party. But he was mistaken. He wished for peace that he might have the enjoyment of his pleasures, but the catholic and protestant confederacies waged war against each other, in spite of him. His brother-in-law Henry, the young king of Navarre, commiserating the misfortunes of France, which he probably foresaw would one day be his own kingdom, wrote to Henry III., painted to him in the strongest colours the mischiefs that attended that armed association, and generously offered his fortune and his life for his protection and defence; but Henry III. was weak enough to listen rather to the pope's bull, which stigmatized the king of Navarre and the prince of Condé as heretics. He rejected the offers of his brother-in-law, continued the persecution of the protestants, and thus aided the duke of Guise in his scheme to dispossess him of his kingdom. He saw his error when it was too late, and was obliged to solicit that assistance which he had rejected when offered. He had disgraced himself by acts of the most impolitic cruelty, and, unable to crush the schemes of the duke of Guise by a manly resistance and vigorous exertions of authority, he meanly employed assassins to murder that prince, and his brother the cardinal of Lorraine, in the castle of Blois. This cruel and dissolute tyrant continued to reign for fifteen years. His kingdom was at length delivered from him by the hand of a fanatic

enthusiast. Jacques Clement, a jacobin monk, actuated by the belief that he was doing an act of consummate piety, insinuated himself into the palace, and stabbed the king with a knife in the belly. The assassin was put to death on the spot by the king's guards, and Henry died in a few days of the wound.

As the succeeding monarch of France had begun before this time to display his illustrious talents, I shall give a short, uninterrupted sketch of his memorable life.

Henry of Navarre, the first of the house of Bourbon, who sat on the throne of France, was descended in a direct male line, from Robert count of Clermont, and lord of Bourbon, the sixth son of Louis IX., surnamed Saint Louis. His mother was Jane d'Albret, daughter of Henry d'Albret, king of Navarre. Attached to the party of the Calvinists, she had educated her son in the same principles, and from those talents which he very soon began to display, the party of the Huguenots in France looked up to him as the great support of their interest. In 1569, being at that time only sixteen years of age, he was declared, at Rochelle, chief of the Huguenot party; and the prince of Condé his uncle, with the admiral Coligni, were named to act under him as his lieutenants. They were unsuccessful at the battle of Jarnac, where Condé lost his life, and likewise in the succeeding engagement at Moncontour. In the following year, Charles IX. made peace with the protestant party, in the diabolical view of accomplishing by treachery what he found himself unequal to achieve by his arms. To prove the sincerity of his reconciliation with the Huguenot chiefs, he invited young Henry of Navarre to Paris, and bestowed upon him his sister Margaret of Valois in marriage. The party thus lulled asleep, the barbarous monarch attempted, as we have seen, to extinguish them by a single blow, and in the horrible eve of St. Bartholomew about one hundred thousand fell by the sword. Henry of Navarre, saved

from this massacre of his party by declaring himself a catholic, remained after this event about three years a prisoner. After the death of Charles IX., having found means to escape to Alençon, in the year 1576, he put himself once more at the head of the protestants. The conduct of the party we have already seen during the reign of Henry III. This monarch, on his death-bed, had acknowledged Henry of Navarre the lawful heir to the crown. Three sons of Henry II. had now reigned consecutively; and, having no children, Henry of Navarre, descended from Louis IX., was indeed the first prince of the blood, and consequently the nearest in succession to the throne. But he had to combat the formidable opposition of *The League*, who chose for their sovereign the cardinal of Bourbon, Vendôme. The pope was of necessity Henry's enemy; and Philip II. of Spain encouraged his son-in-law the duke of Savoy to invade Dauphiné and Provence. Henry had nothing to support him but the justice of his cause, his own courage, and the zeal of his small party. The first successful effort of his arms was at Arques, in the neighbourhood of Dieppe, where with five thousand men he defeated the army of the league under the duke of Mayenne, consisting of twenty-five thousand men. His numbers now increased to ten thousand, and he defeated Mayenne a second time, in the celebrated battle of Ivry. He pursued his advantages, and marched directly to Paris. This city, which was strongly in the interest of the league, made a most obstinate resistance; but the Parisians would have been compelled by famine to open their gates to Henry, had not Philip II. sent the duke of Parma with a powerful army to their relief. This event deprived him of the fruit of his victories; but he took such well-concerted steps, that his enemies were able to gain no considerable advantages. The nation, aware of the ambitious views of Philip, began to be afraid of falling under a foreign yoke. Henry was made to understand that the greatest ob-

240 209

stacle to the success of his wishes was his religion. His counsellor Rosni, the celebrated duke of Sully, told him in plain terms, that it was necessary for the salvation of France that he should embrace the catholic faith. The disorders of the kingdom could not otherwise have been composed, nor the schemes of the Spanish monarch defeated. Henry yielded to the necessity of circumstances: he made a formal abjuration at St. Denis, and was crowned king, at Chartres, in the year 1594. The city of Paris was chiefly garrisoned by the Spaniards, but the marshal de Brisac, with infinite address, formed an association of the magistrates and principal citizens, and opened to Henry the gates of the town. He made his public entry into the capital of his kingdom almost without the effusion of blood, and he gave a free pardon to all the partisans of the league; ordering, at the same time, the whole foreign troops instantly to evacuate his dominions. Yet Henry was far from being in possession of the whole of the kingdom of France; and he was obliged to have recourse to as many intrigues as battles, in order to recover it by degrees. Almost his whole life was spent in fighting against one chief or another, in negotiating, and even in purchasing, the submission of his enemies; and, at length, in what situation was this kingdom when he recovered it? The revenues of the state were exhausted, the provinces ruined by neglect and by the ravages of the armies, and the country depopulated. France stood in need of a prince like Henry IV., a genius who understood the arts of peace as well as of war, who was capable of searching into the wounds of the state, and knew how to apply the most effectual remedies.

The ambitious Philip had been far from laying aside his views upon the accession of Henry. His armies continued to ravage the provinces. It was, therefore, necessary for Henry to bend his attention in the first place to the extirpation of these invaders. By the indefatigable industry of his counsellor, Sully, and by

loans from his subjects, he found means to raise those supplies which were necessary for the support of a regular army. He was successful against the Spaniards, who were forced to conclude with him the peace of Vervins, the only advantageous treaty that France had made since the reign of Philip Augustus.

From that time forward he devoted his whole attention to the improvement of his kingdom, and the advancement of the happiness of his subjects. He disbanded all his superfluous troops; he introduced order and economy into the administration of the finances; he reformed the laws, repressed every species of persecution, and brought about the most difficult of all coalitions—a perfect harmony and good understanding between the protestants and catholics. A spirit of commerce and manufactures, the certain proofs of a wise and equitable government, began to diffuse itself through all the provinces of the kingdom. The cities were enlarged and embellished; the capital decorated with magnificent buildings; and the fine arts encouraged by the munificent patronage of a prince whose taste was equal to his liberality.

Henry, whom the pope in the beginning of his career had anathematized, as a heretic and usurper was now the darling son of the church, and the highest favourite of the see of Rome. Such was his credit with Pope Paul V., that the pontiff chose him as his mediator with the state of Venice, and at the request of one who had been formerly excommunicated himself, took off a sentence of excommunication which he had denounced against that republic.

His great political talents were equalled by his private virtues. He was the kindest master, the most affectionate parent and the warmest friend. His manners were noble without the smallest tincture of severity, and he possessed that engaging affability of behaviour, which in him, deriving its origin from a native goodness of heart, was very different from that affected complaisance, the usual courtly engine of ac-

quiring popularity. There was a greatness of soul in this prince which manifested itself in the whole of his character. That generosity in the forgiveness of injuries, which is ever the attendant of a noble mind, was in him most remarkable. Many of those who, in the earlier period of his life had taken the most violent part against him, and who, according to the common rules of human conduct, had nothing to expect after he had attained the throne but punishment, or at least disgrace, were astonished to meet not only with entire forgiveness, but even with marks of favour and confidence. He knew how much even the best natures may be perverted by the spirit of faction. He could not harbour resentment against an humbled adversary, and his own good heart informed him, that an enemy forgiven might become the most valuable of friends. It was thus that he won to himself the affections of those nobles, the chief supporters of the League which so violently opposed his succession to the crown. Of all his enemies, the marshal Biron was the only one who suffered a capital punishment; and to him he had three times offered mercy, on the condition of his making a confession of his crimes.*

To form a proper judgment of this most estimable man, it is necessary to read the Memoirs of the duc de Sully, where we see the picture of the greatest and the most amiable of princes delineated by the hand of a faithful servant, a counsellor, and a companion; a friend who was no less acquainted with the public schemes and the motives of his political conduct than with all the circumstances of his private life.† "Should

* Perefixe relates a little anecdote, which shows that this beautiful feature of Henry's character, the forgiveness of injuries, extended itself to the meanest ranks of his subjects. Being one day in his coach with the marshal d'Estrées, he desired that nobleman to observe one of the life-guards who walked at the coach-door. "That," said he, "is a brave fellow; it was he who wounded me at the battle of Aumale."

† Who is there that can read without emotion the conversa

a faithful picture of this illustrious character," says Voltaire, "be drawn in the hearing of a judicious foreigner who had never before been acquainted with his name; and should the narrator conclude that this very man was at length assassinated in the midst of his people, after repeated attempts against his life by persons to whom he had never done the smallest injury, it would be impossible for him to believe it." Whether this atrocious deed arose from the designs of a party, or was the mere suggestion of a distempered brain in the wretch who perpetrated it, is to this day a matter of doubt and uncertainty. The parricide Ravaillac himself protested that he had no accomplices. On the 14th of May, 1610, as Henry, together with the duke d'Epernon, were on their way to the house of Sully, the prime minister, and while the coach was stopped by some embarrassment in the street, the king, suddenly turning toward one of the windows, was struck twice into the heart with a knife, and instantly expired. The affliction felt by his subjects on this great national calamity was such as no words can describe. There never, perhaps, existed a sovereign

tion that passed between this great man and his confidant Sully at Monceaux, when Henry, attacked with a dangerous illness thought himself dying. "Mon amy, je n'apprehende nullement la mort, comme vous le sçavez mieux que personne, m'ayant vû en tant de périls dont je me fusse bien pu exempter; mais je ne nieray point que je n'aye regret de partir de cette vie sans eslever ce royaume en la splendeur que je m'estois proposée, et avoir tésmoigné a mes peuples, en les soulageant et deschargeant de tant de subsides, et les gouvernant amiablement, que je les aimois comme s'ils estoient mes enfans."—*Sully, Economies Royales*, tom. i. ch. 85.

"I have no fear of death, my friend, as you of all persons best know, having seen me exposed to so many perils, which I could have avoided; but I will not deny that I regret my departure out of life, without having elevated this kingdom to the state of splendour which I had proposed to myself; and showed to my people, by my endeavour to make them happy, to take off their burdens, and to rule them gently, that I loved them as my own children."

who more merited, or who more entirely possessed, the affections of his people. Henry had lived to the age of fifty-seven, and at the time of his death is said to have been employed in projecting one of the greatest and most extraordinary schemes that ever entered into the head of man.*

CHAPTER XXVIII.

ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND IN THE REIGNS OF ELIZABETH AND MARY, QUEEN OF SCOTS:—Personal Enmity of Elizabeth and Mary—Reformation in Scotland—Regency of Mary of Guise—John Knox—Intervention of England—Confession of Faith ratified by Parliament—Mary arrives in Scotland—Artful measures of Elizabeth in Scotland—Murder of Rizzio—of Darnley—Forced Abdication of Mary—James VI. proclaimed—Battle of Langsyde—Mary imprisoned in England—Executed, 1587—Ambitious schemes of the Earl of Essex—Death and character of Elizabeth.

WHILE France was torn by intestine convulsions, and bleeding under the infernal ravages of a merciless zeal, signalized by the memorable massacre of St Bartholomew; while the inhabitants of the Nether lands had shaken off the yoke of Spain, and were bravely vindicating their rights and their religion,—the English nation had attained to a high degree of splendour under the government of a great and politic

* The project of a perpetual peace. The delineation of this great scheme, which was singularly characteristic of the genius as well as the benevolence of its author, is to be found in the Memoirs of the duke of Sully. Though the preparations were actually begun for carrying it into effect, it must in all probability have failed of success, because it took not into account the predominant passions and weaknesses of mankind; and the impossibility of reasoning with nations as with wise individuals.

princess. Elizabeth had been educated in the school of adversity: she was a prisoner during the reign of her sister Mary, and had turned that misfortune to the best advantage, by improving her mind in every great and useful accomplishment. It were to be wished she had cultivated likewise the virtues of the heart, and that her policy (which must be allowed to be extremely refined) had breathed somewhat more of the spirit of generosity and humanity.

Elizabeth had, from the beginning of her reign resolved to establish the protestant religion in her dominions, a measure which the severities of the reign of Mary had rendered not at all difficult. The protestant party had been increasing under persecution; and no sooner were the queen's inclinations signified to the people, than almost the whole nation became protestants from choice. The very first parliament after her accession passed an act in favour of the reformed religion.

Elizabeth's great object was to secure the affections of her people, and this she most thoroughly accomplished. She may be reckoned among the most respected of the English monarchs; though there is no question that she stretched the powers of the crown to a greater height, and her government was more arbitrary and despotic than that of any of her successors, whose encroachments on the rights of the subject gave occasion to such dreadful disquiets, and raised a combustion so fatal to the English nation.

The chief minister of Elizabeth in the beginning of her reign was Robert Dudley, son of the duke of Northumberland; a man whom she seemed to regard from capricious motives, as he was possessed neither of abilities nor virtue. But she was assisted likewise with the counsels of Bacon and of Cecil, men of great capacity and infinite application. They regulated the finances, and directed those political measures with foreign courts that were afterward followed with so much success.

In this reign of Elizabeth the affairs of Scotland were unhappily but too much interwoven with those of England. Henry VII. had given his daughter Margaret in marriage to James V., king of Scotland, who, dying, left no issue that came to maturity, except Mary, afterward queen of Scots. This princess was married when very young to Francis, the dauphin, afterward king of France, who left her a widow at the age of nineteen. As Elizabeth had been declared illegitimate by Henry VIII., in consequence of her mother Anne Bullen's divorce, Mary was persuaded by her ambitious uncle, the duke of Guise, to assume the arms and title of queen of England; and when the English ambassador, at the court of France complained of this injury, he received no satisfaction. This was the foundation of a personal enmity between the rival queens, which subsisted through life, and laid the foundation of a train of misery and misfortune to the queen of Scots.

The reformation in Scotland, though it arose from the most laudable and disinterested motives, was conducted with a spirit of much higher zeal and animosity than in England. The mutual resentment which the protestants and catholics bore to each other in that country was extremely violent. Many of the English preachers, who had fled from the terrors of the persecution under Mary of England, had taken shelter in Scotland. There they propagated their theological tenets, and inspired the greatest part of the kingdom with the utmost horror for the doctrines and worship of the church of Rome. Some of the principal of the Scottish nobility, the earl of Argyle, the earls of Morton, Glencairn, and others, had espoused the doctrines of the reformation. They entered privately into a bond of association in opposition to the established church; and by their own authority they ordained that prayers in the vulgar tongue should be used in all the parish churches of the kingdom, and that preaching and the interpretation of the Scriptures should be

practised in private houses, till God should move the prince to allow a purer system of public worship, under faithful and true ministers. This determined spirit of reformation was much fomented by the furious and most intolerant zeal of the Roman catholics. Hamilton, archbishop of St. Andrew's, a sanguinary bigot, made some attempts to pursue the same horrible methods of conversion of which Queen Mary of England had set the example; and a priest who had embraced the new religion was, by his orders, burnt at the stake. The consequence was, that the whole nation began to look with detestation and abhorrence upon the worship of the catholics; and the associated lords presented a petition to parliament, in which, after they had premised that they could not communicate with the damnable idolatry and intolerable abuses of the church of Rome, they desired that the laws against heretics should be executed by the civil magistrate alone; that the Scriptures should be the sole rule for judging of heresy; and that prayers should be said in the vulgar tongue.

The queen-regent, Mary of Guise, who, in the government of Scotland, followed the intemperate counsels of her brothers, instead of soothing or opposing by gentle methods this spirit of reformation, summoned the chiefs of the protestant party to attend a council at Stirling, and denounced all those as rebels who failed to appear. This violent and imprudent measure enraged the people, and determined them to oppose the regent's authority by force of arms, and to proceed to extremity against the clergy of the established church.

The celebrated John Knox arrived at this time from Geneva, where he had imbibed the doctrines of Calvin, of which his natural disposition fitted him to be a most zealous and intrepid promoter. This reformer was possessed of a very considerable share of learning, and of uncommon acuteness of understanding. He was a man of rigid virtue, and of a very disinterested spirit;

but his maxims (as Dr. Robertson remarks) were too severe, and the impetuosity of his temper was excessive. His eloquence was fitted to rouse and to inflame. His first public appearance was at Perth, where, in a very animated sermon, he wrought up the minds of his audience to such a pitch of fury, that they broke down the walls of the church, overturned the altars, destroyed the images, and almost tore the priests to pieces. The example was contagious, and the same scenes were exhibited in different quarters of the kingdom. The protestant party soon after took up arms. They besieged and took the towns of Perth and Stirling, and thence proceeded, in martial array, to Edinburgh, where they found the people animated with the same zeal, and eagerly flocking to the banner of reformation. Mary of Guise, sensible of her inability to withstand this increasing torrent, took a very impolitic step. She brought over a French army to subdue her subjects of Scotland; and they, with whom the motive of religious zeal far outweighed every other consideration, solicited the aid and succour of the protestant queen of England. Elizabeth acquiesced with the utmost cheerfulness in this demand, which coincided so well with her own views and interest. She despatched an army and fleet to their assistance. The French and the catholic Scots were defeated, and the party lost its head by the death of the queen-regent. A capitulation ensued, and a treaty was signed at Edinburgh, in which the political talents of Elizabeth appeared in their strongest point of view. It was stipulated that the French should instantly evacuate Scotland; that the king and queen of France and Scotland should give up all pretensions to the crown of England; that further satisfaction should be made to Elizabeth for the injury already done her in that particular; and that the Scots might the more readily accede to these articles, which hitherto seemed to regard the interest of England alone, it was, by way of soothing them, stipulated that none but natives should

be put into any office in Scotland. Thus the politic Elizabeth quelled the disorders of that kingdom by the same measure which secured the stability of her own throne, and gave her the highest influence and authority over the Scottish nation.

The reformed religion now happily obtained a full settlement in Scotland. The parliament ratified a confession of faith agreeable to the new doctrines, passed a law against the worship of the mass, and abolished it throughout the kingdom under the most rigorous penalties. The papal jurisdiction was solemnly renounced, and the presbyterian form of discipline was everywhere adopted in place of the catholic.

Matters were in this situation when the young Mary, upon the death of her mother and her husband Francis, was desirous of returning to Scotland to take possession of her throne. Anxiously wishing to cultivate the friendship of Elizabeth, she had laid aside the arms and titles which had given that queen so much offence, and she now asked leave to pass through England, probably in the view of having a personal interview, which might lay the foundation of a mutual good understanding. This request Elizabeth refused, unless on the condition of Mary's ratifying the whole articles of the late treaty. This was not all; she equipped a fleet to intercept and take her prisoner on her passage. This danger, however, Mary escaped, and landed safely in her own dominions.

Mary was zealously attached to the catholic religion, the faith of her ancestors, and this attachment was the primary cause of the greatest of her misfortunes; she found herself regarded as an enemy by all the protestants, the bulk of her subjects, who, on the other hand, regarded her enemy Elizabeth as their patroness and defender. That princess had very early, and before the arrival of Mary in Scotland, taken the most artful measures to secure to herself the management of this kingdom; she had her minister Randolph as a resident in Edinburgh, who had cultivated a perfect

good understanding with the earl of Murray, (the bastard-brother of Mary,) the earl of Morton, and the secretary Maitland of Lethington;—and, these three were the very persons on whom the young queen, harbouring no suspicions, bestowed, upon her first arrival in her kingdom, the utmost confidence. The views of the ambitious Murray aimed at nothing less than his sister's crown; and still, as new obstacles presented themselves in the way of this criminal ambition, his attempts became, in proportion, more daring and more flagitious.

The first obstacle which opposed the ambition of Murray, was the queen's marriage with her cousin Henry, Lord Darnley, the son of the earl of Lenox, who bore likewise the same relation to the queen of England—a match, therefore, in every view, proper and adequate, as it connected the only contending claims to that kingdom after the death of Elizabeth.

Elizabeth, who had the weakness to be jealous of these pretensions, was not disposed to be pleased with any matrimonial connexion which could have been formed by her rival Mary. It was, therefore with the entire approbation of her minister Randolph, and her secretary Cecil, that the earl of Murray formed his first plot for the removal of Darnley, the imprisonment of Mary, and the taking into his own hands the government of Scotland. A conspiracy was formed by Murray to seize the persons of the queen and Darnley. It was discovered by Mary, who, with the assistance of the earl of Athol, and a few troops hastily collected, compelled the traitor and his associates to retire for a while till they had raised sufficient force to rise in open rebellion. They were subdued, however, and Murray fled for shelter into the dominions of Elizabeth. A few of the nobility, whom Murray at first had gained over to his treasonable designs, now returned to their allegiance, and publicly avowed that the intention of the conspiracy had been to put Darnley to death, to imprison the queen, and to usurp

the government. From this period, the same plan, though checked at first, was unremittingly pursued, till it was at length accomplished.

The consort of Mary made an ill return to her affections; he was a weak man, an abandoned profligate, and addicted to the meanest of vices. Pleased as she had been at first with his person and external accomplishments, it was impossible that her affection should not at length have given place to disgust at a character so worthless and despicable; and Darnley, enraged at her increasing coldness, was taught to believe that he was supplanted in the queen's affections by the arts and insinuations of a favourite--a despicable one indeed—the musician Rizzio, whom Mary had promoted to the office of her secretary. Murray, at this time at a distance, had his friends Morton and Lethington at court, who had cautiously avoided having an active share in the late conspiracy. A parliament was called, in which it was expected that Murray and his associates were to be attainted for treason; but to prevent this blow, and likewise to follow out the main scheme, a new plot was devised by Morton and Lethington, of which the weak and vicious Darnley was made an active instrument. The queen was then far advanced in her pregnancy, when, as she was one evening at supper in a private apartment of her palace, along with the countess of Argyle, while her secretary Rizzio, and some other of her domestics were in waiting, the earl of Morton, with one hundred and sixty men, took possession of the palace; a few ruffians in arms broke into the apartment, Darnley himself showing the way by a private staircase; they overturned the table at which the queen sat, and seizing the secretary Rizzio, who clung for protection to the garments of his mistress, they stabbed him to the heart, and thence dragging him into the ante-chamber, laid him dead with numberless wounds.

The purpose of this shocking outrage was extremely evident. From the queen's situation, nothing less

was to be expected than an abortion, and probably the death both of the mother and her child; should this not take place, the odium incurred by Darnley, as the ostensible head and promoter of this conspiracy, must at least be the cause of a total and incurable rupture between him and Mary, a justifiable pretence for those meditated schemes against his life, and even a probable presumption of Mary's acquiescence in any attempts to get rid of a man, against whom she had now so much cause of hatred and disgust. Confiding in the plausibility of these appearances, which to the public eye would, at least with the queen's enemies, induce a strong suspicion of her guilt, the murder of Darnley was immediately resolved on, and a very short time after, the house in which he slept was, in the middle of the night, blown up with gunpowder.

In this murder, planned by Murray, Morton, and Lethington, the earl of Bothwell, there is undoubted reason to believe, was likewise an associate. This nobleman, who had all along shown the greatest appearance of zeal and attachment to the interests of Mary, had from that cause alone, with a little personal merit, attained a very great degree of her favour and esteem. The voice of the public imputed to him the murder of Darnley; but the good opinion which the queen had of him, from his former services, and the just grounds she had to fix that crime upon those who were truly its chief authors and contrivers, exempted this nobleman, in her mind, from all suspicion of guilt.

To satisfy the public opinion, however, Bothwell was tried by his peers for the murder of Darnley, and no evidence being brought against him, he was absolved by the verdict of a jury. The queen, who had never believed him guilty, had now, as she thought, a perfect assurance of his innocence. He stood high in her favour; and, prompted by ambition, began to aspire at the dangerous honour of obtaining her hand in marriage. These views, being known to Murray

and his associates, seemed to afford, at length, a most promising means for accomplishing the ruin of Mary, and throwing into their hands the government of the kingdom. It now, therefore, became, their great object to bring about the marriage of Bothwell with the queen; a formal deed, or bond, was for that purpose framed by the earl of Morton and the chief nobility of his party, recommended Bothwell in the strongest terms as the most proper person she could choose for a husband. Mary gave into the snare; she married Bothwell, a measure which is the most indefensible part of her conduct; for, however she might have been persuaded of his innocence, of which this request of her chief nobility was certainly a very strong testimony, yet the public voice still pointed him out as an associate in the murder of her husband; and to marry this man was a measure as indecent as it was ruinous and impolitic.

The plan of Murray, of Morton, and their allies had now succeeded to their utmost wish, and it was unnecessary any longer to keep on the mask. Bothwell, their instrument in the murder of Darnley, had, by their means, become the husband of Mary. They had thus brought about what to the world would be a strong presumption of her being an accomplice in that murder: and the same Morton and his associates, who had signed that infamous bond, asserting Bothwell's innocence, and recommending him in the strongest terms as a suitable husband to their queen, now formed an association, within a few weeks of their marriage, to make them both prisoners in their palace. On receiving intelligence of this design, Bothwell found means to escape over seas to Denmark; but Mary delivered herself without reserve into the hands of her enemies, who immediately confined her, under a strong guard, in the castle of Lochleven.*

* These black deeds, and the whole of this infernal policy, is thus laid open by Camden, a contemporary author, a ver-

Morton and the associated lords had now the sole government of the kingdom. They were, however, desirous of giving their authority a legal sanction;

son under the patronage, and intrusted with the papers of Secretary Cecil himself.

"Murray," he says, who had taken arms because of Mary's match with Darnley, "fled into England; and there being frustrate of all hope of aid, he dealt by letters with Morton, a man of a deep and subtile reach, who was his inward friend, and as it were his right hand; that seeing the marriage could not be annulled, yet, at least, *the love betwixt them as man and wife might, by close contrivances, be dissolved.* Morton, being a man skilled in kindling discontents, insinuateth himself into the young king's mind by soothing flatteries, and persuadeth him to put on the crown of Scotland, even against the queen's will, and to free himself from the command of a woman. By this counsel he hoped not only to alienate the queen, but also the nobility and commons quite from the king. And to alienate the queen, first he inconseth the king by sundry slanders to the murder of David Rizzio, a Piemontois; lest, he being a subtile fellow, might prevent their designs. Then the more to alienate her, he persuadeth the king to be present himself at the murther. The king, now considering the foulness of the late act, and seeing the queen was very angry, repented him of his rashness, humbly fled with tears and lamentations to her clemency, and craving pardon for his fault, freely confessed, that, through the persuasion of Murray and Morton, he had undertaken the fact. And from that time forward he bore such hatred to Murray (for Morton, Reuven, and the others were fled into England for the murther of David, with Murray's letters of commendation to the Earl of Bedford,) that he cast in his mind to make him away. But whereas, through youthly heat, he could neither conceal his thoughts, nor durst execute them (such was his observance towards the queen his wife,) he told her that it would be for the good of the commonwealth and the security of the royal family, if Murray were made away. She, detesting the matter, terrified him with threats from such purposes, hoping again to reconcile them. But he, stomaching the power which the bastard had with the queen his sister, through impatience communicated the same design to others. When this came to Murray's ears, he to prevent the same, under colour of duty, contriveth more secret plots against the young king's life, using Morton's counsel though he were absent. These two, above all things, thought it best utterly to alienate the queen's

and for that purpose a deed was prepared, by which the queen should resign all concern in the government in favour of her son, then an infant a few months old,

mind from the king, their love being not yet well renewed; and to draw Bothwell into their society, who was lately reconciled to Murray, and was in great grace with the queen; putting him in hope of divorce from his wife, and marriage with the queen as soon as she was a widow. To the performance hereof, and to defend him against all men, they bound themselves under their hands and seals; supposing that if the matter succeeded, they could with one and the same labour make away the king, weaken the queen's reputation amongst the nobility and commons, tread down Bothwell, and draw unto themselves the whole managing of the state. Bothwell, being a wicked-minded man, blinded with ambition, and thereby desperately bold to attempt, soon laid hold on the hope propounded, and lewdly committed the murther; whilst Murray scarce fifteen hours before, had withdrawn himself farther off to his own house, lest he should come within suspicion; and he might from thence, if need were, relieve the conspirators, and the whole suspicion might light upon the queen. A rumour was forthwith spread all over Britain, laying the fact and fault upon Morton, Murray and other confederates; they, insulting over the weak sex of the queen, lay it upon her. No sooner was he returned to the court, but he and the conspirators commended Bothwell to the queen for an husband, as most worthy of her love, for the dignity of his house, for his notable service of the English, and his singular fidelity. Now, the confederates' whole care and labour was that Bothwell might be acquitted of the murther of the king. A parliament, therefore, is forthwith summoned for no other cause, and proclamations set forth that such as were suspected of the murther should be apprehended. And whereas Lenox, the murdered king's father, accused Bothwell to be the murtherer of the king, and instantly pressed that he might be brought to his trial before the assembly of the estates began; this also was granted, and Lenox was commanded to appear within twenty days to prosecute the matter against him. Upon which day Bothwell was arraigned and acquitted by sentence of the judges, Morton managing his cause. This business being despatched, the conspirators so wrought the matter, that very many of the nobility assented to the marriage, setting their hands to a writing to that purpose; lest he, being excluded from his promised marriage, should accuse them as contrivers of the whole fact. By means of this mar-

and agreeing that the affairs of the kingdom should, in the meantime, be administered by the earl of Murray as regent. This deed the queen at first peremptorily refused to sign, till at length being told that force would be used to compel her to it, she complied with many tears. In consequence of this, the young prince was crowned at Stirling by the name of James VI., and Murray took upon him the government of the kingdom.

A great part of the nation were justly indignant at these proceedings; yet many more were imposed on by the profound artifice with which the conductors of these measures had veiled their designs. The queen, however, being apprized of the favourable dispositions of many of her nobility, and a considerable proportion of her subjects, found means to escape from the place of her confinement; and in a few days, she was at the head of an army of six thousand men. The regent, on his part, assembled his forces, and an engagement en-

rage with Bothwell, the suspicion grew strong amongst all men, that the queen was privy to the murther of the king, which suspicion the conspirators increased by sending letters all about; and in secret meetings at Dunkeld, they presently conspired the deposing of the queen, and the destruction of Bothwell. Yet Murray, that he might seem to be clear from the whole conspiracy, craved leave of the queen to go into France. Scarce was he crossed over out of England, when behold! those which had acquitted Bothwell from the guilt of the murther, and gave him their consent under their hands to the marriage, took arms against him as if they would apprehend him; whereas, indeed, they gave him secret notice to provide for himself by flight; and this to no other purpose, but *lest he, being apprehended, should reveal the whole plot; and that they might allege his flight as an argument to accuse the queen of the murther of the king*. Having next intercepted her, they used her in the most disgraceful and unworthy manner; and clothing her in a vile weed, thrust her into prison at Lochleven, under the custody of Murray's mother, who, having been James V. his concubine, most malapertly aggravated the calamity of the imprisoned queen, boasting that she was the lawful wife of James V. and that her son Murray was his lawful issue."—*Camden*, pp. 88, 91, 94.

sued at Langside, where the queen's army was totally defeated. Mary, with a few attendants, fled with precipitation into the north of England, where she humbly craved the interposition of Queen Elizabeth for her aid and protection.

That artful princess, who had all along employed a secret, though a busy hand, in the machinations of the Scottish confederacy, saw her end now accomplished in obtaining the absolute possession of the kingdom of Scotland. She was possessed of the person of the queen; and Murray and his party were devoted to her interest, from the motive of securing themselves in the administration. It was, therefore, no part of the views of Queen Elizabeth to assist the queen of Scots, though honour and a concern for her own reputation in the eyes of the world made it necessary for her to assume the mask of friendship. Mary had requested to be admitted to an interview with her; but this was refused her by Elizabeth, on the pretence that she lay under the foul aspersion of being accessory to the murder of her husband, from which it was necessary that she should first clear herself. Mary, though, as a sister sovereign, she was under no obligation to submit to the jurisdiction of Elizabeth as a judge, yet, lest her silence might be interpreted to her prejudice, agreed to justify her conduct. A conference was appointed for that purpose. The earls of Murray and Morton produced a direct charge against Mary of being accessory to the murder of her husband, which they founded upon certain letters affirmed to be written from the queen to Bothwell, containing plain intimations of her guilt. Mary desired to be indulged with a sight of these letters, and undertook to prove them forgeries; and she very reasonably made that request a preliminary condition to her stating any defence against the charge of her accusers. This request, however, was refused; copies only of the letters were produced; she was not allowed to see or

examine the originals, and the conference broke off.* The queen of England dismissed Murray and his associates back to Scotland, and kept Mary a prisoner in close confinement.

Elizabeth's own nobility appear now to have seen through the ungenerous policy of their sovereign, and to have condemned her conduct to the queen of Scots as disgraceful and inhumane. The duke of Norfolk, the first peer of the realm, whom Elizabeth had appointed her chief commissioner for examination of the evidence against Mary, immediately after the breaking up of the conferences courted her in marriage; a circumstance strongly presumptive of his belief in the innocence of Mary, though the scheme proved fatal to that nobleman, and was much prejudicial to the interests of the queen of Scots. The influence of Norfolk, and his numerous connexions among the principal nobility, were of themselves sufficient to excite the jealousy of Elizabeth; he had concealed from her his matrimonial views; and when these were discovered, her fears suggested the most dangerous consequences. Norfolk was committed to the Tower; his friends rose in rebellion for his deliverance. Their attempts were suppressed. Elizabeth restored him to his liberty; but a new insurrection, of which the object was the deliverance of Mary and the accomplishment of her marriage with Norfolk, brought that unfortunate nobleman to the scaffold, and hastened the fate of the Scottish queen.

Mary, who it does not appear had as yet any part in those insurrections of which her deliverance was

* The forgery of these letters and of the sonnets, pretended to be written by Mary to Bothwell, has been proved with an overpowering force of accumulated evidence, by Mr. Goodall, Mr. Tytler, Dr. Stuart, and Mr. Whitaker.—See Goodall's Examination of the History of Queen Mary; Tytler's Inquiry, Historical and Critical, into the Evidence of Mary, Queen of Scots; Stuart's History of Scotland; and Whitaker's Mary Queen of Scots vindicated.

made the object, worn out at length with the miseries of her confinement, and continually apprehensive of a violent and a cruel death—which Elizabeth, as it appears from letters under her hand and her secretary's, did not hesitate to prompt her keepers privately to inflict upon her—began now secretly to solicit the aid of foreign princes for her rescue. She had for that purpose her agents at the courts of Spain, of France, in the Low Countries, and in Rome. The Catholic party in England espoused her cause; an invasion was projected from abroad; and a conspiracy was formed, of which the objects were the deliverance of Mary, the establishment of the Catholic religion, and the assassination of Queen Elizabeth. This dangerous conspiracy was detected by the address of the secretary Walsingham, and the principal agents deservedly suffered death. There was undoubted evidence that Mary had intelligence and concern in that part of the design which regarded her own deliverance; and it being thence inferred that she was privy to the scheme of assassination, it was now resolved to bring her to trial as a criminal for that offence.

The greatest difficulty to be overcome on the part of Elizabeth was the plea most forcibly urged by Mary, that she was an independent princess; that she owed no allegiance to Elizabeth, no obedience to her laws, no submission to her tribunals; and that though she might, as a sister sovereign, deign to vindicate her character to the world if she were at liberty, she would never condescend, while forcibly detained a prisoner, to plead for her life at the bar of any court whatever. This difficulty was most artfully removed on the part of Elizabeth. It was urged to Mary by her judges, that she injured her reputation by avoiding a trial, in which her innocence might be proved to the satisfaction of all mankind. This observation so powerfully impressed her, that she forgot the dictates of prudence, and agreed to submit to a tribunal where her condemnation was certain and inevitable. Two of her sec-

retaries, corrupted, as was supposed, for the purpose, swore to certain letters dictated by her, which proved an acquiescence in the whole conspiracy. Mary desired that she might be confronted with her secretaries, who, she affirmed, would not, to her face, persist in a false accusation; but this request was refused: the evidence was held conclusive, and the queen of Scots was condemned to suffer death; a sentence which was executed on the 8th day of February, 1587, in the forty-fifth year of her age, and nineteenth of her captivity in England. Previously to this event, Murray had fallen the victim of the private revenge of one Hamilton of Bothwell-haugh, whom he had injured; Lethington, seized with remorse, took part with his injured sovereign, and poisoned himself in prison, to escape the sentence of his enemies; Morton, for some time regent of the kingdom, and in that capacity the object of universal hatred for his crimes and vices, was finally brought to trial and suffered death, on a full proof of his concern in the murder of Darnley. Such was the merited reward of their inhuman treasons.

The attention of the English was now called aside from dwelling on this disastrous event by the formidable preparations made by Philip II. of Spain for an invasion of the kingdom. The unsuccessful issue of all these preparations we have already recorded in treating of the reign of that monarch. Of the whole of the invincible Armada there returned to Spain only fifty-three shattered ships; and the seamen as well as soldiers who remained, only served by their accounts to intimidate their countrymen from attempting to renew so dangerous an enterprise. The English, on the other hand, were incited to make some descents, in their turn, upon the Spanish coasts; and Elizabeth's navy, under the command of those great admirals Raleigh, Howard, Drake, Cavendish, and Hawkins, began to establish that superiority at sea which Britain ever since has almost uninterruptedly maintained.

Among those who chiefly distinguished themselves

in these Spanish expeditions, was the young earl of Essex, a nobleman of great courage, fond of glory, and of a most enterprising disposition. He possessed no less the talents of a warrior than of a finished courtier; yet his impetuosity was apt to exceed the bounds of prudence. He was haughty, and utterly impatient of advice or control. Elizabeth, then almost sixty years of age, was smitten with the personal charms of this accomplished youth; for it was peculiar to the queen, that though she had always rejected a husband, she was passionately fond of having a lover. The flattery of her courtiers had persuaded her that, though wrinkled and even deformed, she was yet young and beautiful;[k] and she was not sensible of any disparity in choosing Essex for her partner in all the masks at court. Dudley, earl of Leicester, had died some time before. The death of Lord Burleigh, which happened soon after Essex came into favour, left him without a rival, not only in the queen's affections, but in the direction of her councils. The brilliant station which he now occupied, and still more the haughti-

[k] A curious proof how desirous Elizabeth was of the praise of beauty exists in a proclamation issued by her in 1563, in the thirty-third year of her age, and fifth of her reign, which sets forth, that, from the great desire which all ranks of people have shown to have portraits of her majesty, there have been a great number of pictures made "which do not sufficiently express the natural representation of her majesty's person, favour, or grace, but for the most part have erred therein;—And for that her majesty perceiveth that a great number of her loving subjects are much grieved, and take great offence with the errors and deformities already committed by sundry persons in this behalf;—Therefore she straitly charges all manner of persons to forbear from painting, graving, printing, or making any portrait of her majesty, or from showing or publishing such as are apparently deformed, until some perfect pattern or example shall be made by some coming person, which shall be approved by her," &c. &c. This proclamation is published in the Archæologia of the London Society of Antiquaries, vol. ii., p. 169, from the original draught in the handwriting of Secretary Cecil.

ness of his temper, procured him many enemies; while the openness and unreservedness of his disposition gave these enemies every advantage. A rebellion had been for many years fomenting in Ireland, and the earl of Tyrone, who headed the malcontents, had committed infinite devastations in that country, and threatened with his party to shake off all dependance on the crown of England. Essex was deputed to quell these disorders; he was, however, unsuccessful, and procured nothing further than a cessation of hostilities. His enemies at court took occasion from this miscarriage to undermine him in the favour of the queen—a purpose to which he himself contributed by hastily throwing up his command, and returning without leave to England. He trusted, it is probable, to the empire he had obtained over the queen's affections, which was, indeed, so great, that in spite of the highest dissatisfaction at his conduct, he was soon as much in her good graces as ever. But this impetuous and incautious man lost himself at length irretrievably by some personal reflections which he unguardedly threw out against his royal mistress. It was told her that his affection was all grimace, and that he had frequently declared that he thought the queen as deformed in her mind as she was crooked in her body. She now considered Essex as entirely unworthy of her esteem, and permitted his enemies to drive him to those extremities to which the impetuosity of his own disposition continually prompted him. Among other wild projects, he had concerted with some of his friends to beset the palace, to take possession of the queen's person, and forcibly compel her to remove all from her councils that were disagreeable or obnoxious to him; a scheme which one can hardly suppose to have proceeded from a brain that was not distempered. It was the fortune of Elizabeth's government, that all the machinations of her enemies were frustrated by a timely discovery. The queen's favour would, perhaps, have been still extended to

him, but for another attempt equally treasonable, and yet more extravagant in its nature. This was to raise the city of London; and at the head of the citizens, with whom he believed himself extremely popular, to attain an absolute authority in the kingdom, and the removal of all his enemies. But he was deceived in the notion of his own popularity—he was opposed by the citizens—and being attacked in the streets, was compelled to retreat for shelter into his own house. His case was now desperate: he maintained a siege in his house against the queen's troops, and was at length compelled to surrender himself at discretion. He was tried by his peers, found guilty, and condemned to death as a traitor. The queen, with real reluctance, signed the warrant for his execution; and he was privately beheaded in the Tower, in the thirty-fifth year of his age.

From the death of Essex, the queen, now in the seventieth year of her age, seemed to lose all enjoyment of life. She fell into profound melancholy, she reflected then with remorse on some past actions of her reign, and was at times under the most violent emotions of anguish and despair. Her constitution, enfeebled by age, very soon fell a victim to her mental disquietude; and perceiving her end approaching, she declared that the succession to the crown of England should devolve to her immediate heir, James VI. of Scotland. She died on the 24th of March, 1603, after a reign of forty-five years. There are few personages in history who have been more exposed to the calumny of enemies and the adulation of friends than Queen Elizabeth. It is probable that her character varied considerably in the different periods of her life; yet upon the whole, it is not difficult to pronounce a uniform judgment with regard to the conduct of this illustrious princess. The vigour of her mind, her magnanimity, her penetration, vigilance, and address, certainly merited the highest praises. She was frugal without avarice, enterprising without

temerity, and of an active temper; yet free from imbulance and vain ambition. On the other hand, as a queen, she was rigid to her people, imperious to her courtiers, insincere in her professions, and often a hypocrite in her public measures; as a woman, she was suspicious, jealous, and cruel. She was intemperate in her anger, insatiable in her desire of admiration, and, with all her excellent sense, continually the dupe of flattery.

Few sovereigns succeeded to the throne of England in more difficult circumstances, and none ever conducted the government with more uniform success and felicity; but, in fact, there never was a sovereign who carried the notions of her prerogative higher than Queen Elizabeth, or had so thorough a disregard for her people's liberties. Those engines of arbitrary power which, in the hands of her successors, excited that indignant spirit of the people which ended at length in the destruction of the constitution, were employed by this politic queen without the smallest murmur on the part of her subjects. The tyranny of the courts of Star chamber, and of High Commission, which we shall see the cause of those violent ferments in the time of Charles I., was most patiently submitted to under Elizabeth. The tone of the queen to her parliament was, "I discharge you from presuming to meddle with affairs of state, which are matters above your comprehension." So distant was the condition of the subjects in those so much vaunted days of Queen Elizabeth from that degree of liberty which we at present enjoy—a consideration, this, which ought to produce at least a respect for that improved constitution which has secured to us that valuable blessing, and a patriotic desire to preserve this constitution inviolate, and to maintain its equal balance, distant alike from the tyrannical encroachments of arbitrary power, and the insatiable claims of popular faction.

CHAPTER XXIX.

GREAT BRITAIN, in the Reigns of JAMES I. and CHARLES I.—Accession of James VI. of Scotland to the throne of England—Change of popular feeling on the rights of the subject—Gunpowder Plot—His unworthy favourites—Pacific reign—Death—Charles I.—Differences with his first Parliament—Petition of Rights—Religious innovations attempted in England and Scotland augment the discontents—The National Covenant—Proceedings of Charles's last Parliament—Impeachment and Execution of Strafford—Bill passed declaring Parliament perpetual—Catholic Religion in Ireland made a pretext for the Parliament levying an Army—Bench of Bishops impeached and imprisoned—King impeaches five members of the House of Commons—Civil War—Solemn league and covenant—Scots cooperate with Parliament—Cromwell—Battle of Naseby—Cromwell turns the Army against the Parliament—Trial and Execution of Charles—Reflections.

UPON the death of Elizabeth, the crown of England passed with great tranquillity to her successor, James VI., king of Scotland, whose right united whatever descent, bequest, or parliamentary sanction could confer. If James mounted the throne with the entire approbation and even affection of his English subjects, it is certain that he did not long preserve them. He was unpopular from his manners, which were pedantic and austere, from his preference to his Scottish courtiers, and still more so from his high notions of an uncontrollable prerogative, which he was continually sounding in the ears of his subjects, both in his parliamentary speeches and in the works which he published; a bad policy, which, giving occasion to men to examine into the ground of those pretensions, served only to expose their weakness. The vigour of Elizabeth's government scarce left room to scrutinize its foundation, but her successor was fond of such disputes, and was never so happy as when engaged in a learned argument upon the *divine right* of kings. About this period, the minds of men throughout all Europe seem

to have undergone a very perceptible revolution. The study of letters began to be generally cultivated. Philosophy led to speculative reasonings on laws, on government, on religion, and on politics. In England, especially, which, in point of science, possessed a higher reputation at this period than any of the European kingdoms, these studies had a sensible influence on the current of public opinion. The love of liberty, which is inherent in all ingenuous nations, acquired new force, and began to furnish more extensive views of the rights of the subject than had prevailed in any former period of the constitution.

James, though of no mean capacity, was yet so blinded by self-conceit, and by the prejudices of education, that he failed to perceive this revolution, so dangerous to absolute or despotic power.* His reign was, therefore, a silent but a continued struggle between the prerogative of the crown and the rights of the people. The seeds were sown of that spirit of resistance, which, though it did not break out in his time into acts of violence, proved afterward fatal to his successor.

Domestic events were such as chiefly signalized the reign of James I. He was scarcely seated on the throne, when he became the object of at least an alleged conspiracy, in which Lord Cobham, Lord Grey, and Sir Walter Raleigh were associated. Cobham

* "It appears," says Hume, "from the speeches and proclamations of James I., and the whole train of that prince's actions, as well as his son's, that he regarded the English government as a simple monarchy, and never imagined that any considerable part of his subjects entertained a contrary idea. This opinion made those monarchs discover their pretensions, without preparing any force to support them; and even without reserve or disguise, which are always employed by those who enter upon any new project, or endeavour to innovate in any government. The flattery of courtiers further confirmed their prejudices; and above all, that of the clergy, who, from several passages of Scripture, and these wrested too, had erected a regular and avowed system of arbitrary power."—*Essay on the Protestant Succession.*

and Grey were pardoned. Raleigh underwent a trial, which, though the issue declared him guilty, leaves the mind in a state of absolute skepticism, with regard to the reality of this conspiracy, or of his concern in it. Raleigh's sentence was suspended for the course of fifteen years, during most of which time he was confined in the Tower, where he employed himself in the composition of his History of the World, a work excellent in point of style, and in many branches valuable in point of matter. In the last year of his life he received the king's commission of admiral to undertake an expedition for the discovery of some rich mines in Guiana. This which, if not law, humanity at least ought to have interpreted into a pardon of his offence, was however not so understood by the monarch, whose heart had no great portion of the generous feeling. Raleigh's expedition was unsuccessful; the court of Spain complained of an attack which he had made upon one of their settlements. James wished to be at peace with Spain, and Raleigh at his return was ordered to be beheaded on his former sentence.

In the second year of this reign was framed another plot of a more dangerous nature, and one of the most infernal that ever entered into the human breast to conceive—the *Gunpowder Treason.* The circumstances of this conspiracy, which had for its object to cut off at one blow the king and the whole body of the parliament, are so generally known as to need no detail. It had originated from the disgust and disappointment of the Catholics, who, on the accession of James, the son of a Catholic, had formed to themselves illusive hopes of the establishment of their religion. It was discovered from a circumstance of private friendship; for, strange as it may appear, such hellish designs are not always incompatible with a degree of the social and benevolent affections. The conduct of the king in the punishment of this conspiracy was an instance of moderation, if not humanity. The ma-

jority of his people would have gladly seen an utter extinction of the whole Catholics in the kingdom. But James confined the vengeance of the laws to those only who were actually engaged in the plot—a measure which was by a great part of his subjects construed into his own tacit inclination to favour the Popish superstitions—an idea of which the absurdity was yet greater than its illiberality.

It was perhaps the small share which James had of the affections of his people that produced his attachment to particular favourites. Robert Carr, whom he had created Earl of Somerset, had no other pretensions to recommend him but a graceful person and a good address. He was a weak and an unprincipled man. He fell from the king's favour on conviction of his being guilty of a crime for which he should have suffered an ignominious death—the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury. Somerset had married the countess of Essex—a most debauched woman, who, to accomplish this marriage, had procured a divorce from the Earl of Essex, in which she had found a chief obstacle in Sir Thomas Overbury, a confidant of Somerset. This flagitious woman now prevailed on her husband, Somerset, to have Overbury removed by poison, which they accomplished in a most barbarous manner, by feeding him daily for some months with poisoned victuals, while confined, through the means of Somerset, in the Tower. For this murder Somerset and his countess were condemned to suffer death, but they both received the king's pardon.* His place was supplied by George Villiers, afterward Duke of Buckingham, on whom the king, in the space of a few years, lavished all possible honours; yet this man

* State Trials, Vol. i.; and Sir Fulke Greville's Five Years of King James, in the Harleian Miscellany, vol. vii. Mallet, in his life of Bacon, takes up the calumnious report, which was spread by some of the king's enemies, that James was privy to the murder of Overbury: but the circumstances of presumption which he mentions are quite inconclusive.

was devoid of every talent of a minister; he was headstrong in his passions, imprudent, impolitic and capricious. He was distinguished by a romantic spirit which led him into the most extravagant excesses; and the indulgence of his favourite passions had their influence even upon the public measures of the nation. He projected an absurd expedition of Charles, the Prince of Wales, into Spain, on a visit in disguise, to the Infanta, the daughter of Philip IV., who had been proposed to him as a desirable match. Their adventures on this expedition have more the air of romance than of history; but Buckingham was the hero of the piece. He filled all Madrid with his intrigues, his amours, serenades, challenges, and jealousies. He insulted the prime minister Olivarez by openly making love to his wife, as he did afterward, with still more folly and insolence to the queen of France; in short the projected match with the Infanta seemed to be the least object of Buckingham's journey, and it accordingly was never concluded.

The pacific inclinations of James I., though they contributed in the main to the happiness of his subjects, were unfavourable to the glory and honour of the nation. James had some talents which would have qualified him to shine in a private station; but he had none of the distinguishing virtues of a monarch. His conduct toward his son-in-law, the Elector Palatine, then dispossessed of his dominions by the emperor Ferdinand II., has been generally and most justly censured as mean, dastardly, and inglorious. The whole nation would have gladly armed in defence of the fugitive prince, and repeated addresses were made by parliament to incite James to make a vigorous effort in his behalf. He was at length compelled to send a feeble armament to the continent without sufficient preparations for its support. Famine and a pestilential distemper cut off one half of the troops, and the other were too weak to be of any service. This was the only attempt toward a military expedi-

tion during the reign of James I., who soon after died in the fifty-ninth year of his age, after he had swayed the sceptre of England for twenty-two years, and that of Scotland from his cradle.

We have shortly taken notice of some of those maxims of government adopted during the reign of Elizabeth and her predecessors—the high stretches of the prerogative of the crown, and that tone of despotic authority used by the sovereign to the parliament, which seemed by the general consent of the nation to be then understood as agreeable to the constitution of England. But this was a false idea: the actual government and the constitution are two things extremely different. The rights of the subject, though long forgotten and neglected, were not extinguished: they were overlooked during the wars with France, and the civil commotions between the houses of York and Lancaster; they were overpowered under the artful and splendid despotism of the House of Tudor; but under the first sovereign of the house of Stuart, the nation began gradually to awake from its lethargy; a few threw back their eyes to the ancient charters of freedom, to which the impolitic discourses of the prince had called their attention; and in the reign of his son we shall now see that spirit completely roused, which was not to be satisfied with the attainment of more than ancient liberty—a spirit highly laudable in its first exertions, but fatal and even deplorable afterward in its immediate consequences.

It may be allowed, on an impartial estimate of the character and personal qualities of Charles I., that, had the nation in his reign entertained no higher ideas of the liberty of the subject, or of the powers of parliament, than those which prevailed during the two preceding centuries, this prince would have reigned with high popularity. It was his misfortune to fill the throne of England at the period of this remarkable crisis in the public opinions, and to be educated in the highest notions of the powers of the crown at

the time when those usurped powers were justly doomed to come to an end. It was his misfortune, too, that with many good dispositions, and a very large share of mental endowments, he wanted that political prudence which should have taught him to yield to the necessity of the times, and that it was wiser to abandon a little of that power which he conceived to be his right, than by obstinately maintaining it to its utmost extent, to risk an entire deprivation of it.

Charles discorded with his first parliament. He was ambitious of sending an effectual aid to his brother-in-law the Elector Palatine—a measure which parliament, in the preceding reign, had most strongly prompted. But this parliament repressed his ardour by voting a supply totally inadequate to his purposes. The honour of the king was engaged to his foreign allies; he was resolved to carry on the war: and dissolving the parliament, he betook himself to the expedient often employed by his predecessors of issuing warrants under the privy seal for borrowing money of the subject. The first military expedition was unsuccessful, and a new parliament, to whom Charles made application for new supplies, was yet less complying than the former. His minister the duke of Buckingham was impeached upon pretences extremely frivolous; the prosecution was dropped; and Charles, while he heaped fresh honours upon his favourite, revenged himself for this supposed insult by imprisoning two of the members of the House of Commons.

Thus the quarrel began between the king and parliament; trifling at first, these causes of dissension, but daily receiving addition from new offences, till they grew into confirmed disgust on both sides.

Unable to obtain supplies from parliament, Charles was frequently compelled to the measure of raising money by loans from the subject; but what made this measure an intolerable grievance, was, that soldiers

were billeted on such as refused to lend, and some were even imprisoned on that account alone. These arbitrary proceedings justly excited universal discontent, and the ill-humour of the nation was further increased by a war against France at Buckingham's instigation, which ended in a fruitless attempt upon Rochelle. The parliament, again dissolved, made way for a new House of Commons, animated with the same spirit as their predecessors. They began seriously to reform the constitution. It was immediately voted, that all methods of raising money without consent of parliament were illegal—that it was a violation of the people's liberties to billet soldiers on them, or to compel them to loans by imprisonment. A solemn deed, entitled *A Petition of Right*, was framed and digested, of which the objects were to abolish these loans, and all taxes raised without consent of parliament, as well as the arbitrary practice of billeting soldiers, and martial law. The bill passed the two houses of parliament, and was at length with some difficulty assented to by the king, who was naturally much mortified at this violent retrenchment of what, from the example of his predecessors, he esteemed the established prerogative of the crown.

The Commons, who had thus far proceeded in the great design of vindicating the liberties of the people, began now to carry their scrutiny into every part of the government. One great cause of discontent was removed by the death of the duke of Buckingham, who was stabbed by an Irish fanatic. But grievances of a more serious nature still remained to be redressed. The duty of *tunnage* and *poundage*, a small tax on each tun of wine and pound of commodities, was one of the methods of levying money which Charles believed a part of the crown's prerogative, and at the same time not directly contrary to the Petition of Right, as though it stood on the footing of an original parliamentary grant, it had often been continued from one reign to another without being renewed by par-

liament. It was easy to see, that though the king himself and the partisans of the crown might in reality satisfy their consciences, that in levying this duty there was no breach of the late concessions made by the Petition of Right, it was sufficient to afford a very strong handle to the opposite party to complain of a violation of that statute.

Charles, continuing to levy those exceptionable duties of tunnage and poundage, had proceeded so far as to imprison one of the members of the House on his refusal to pay them. This imprudent violence threw the Commons into the most outrageous ferment, which the king found no other means of effectually quelling but by a new dissolution of the parliament, which he did now with a firm determination of calling no more such assemblies till he should perceive the symptoms of a more compliant disposition.

To avoid the occasion of new supplies, Charles made peace with France and Spain; but money was requisite for the support of government, and he now found it necessary to continue to levy the duties of tunnage and poundage, together with the tax on ship-money, an assessment on the whole counties for victualling and supporting the navy; and high fines were imposed for various offences, without any judicial trial, by the sole authority of the court of Star-chamber. It is true, that all these exertions of power were sanctioned by former custom, and now in a manner authorized by absolute necessity; yet there is not a doubt that they were unconstitutional: it was, therefore, with a most laudable spirit that John Hampden, a member of the House of Commons, refused to pay the tax of ship-money, and brought the question to a trial before the Exchequer Chamber, where, in the opinion of most men, it was decided with great partiality in favour of the crown; a decision, indeed, which gave Charles grounds for persevering in it as a legal measure; but his real interest suffered essentially by that judgment, which increased the party of the discon-

tented, and taught men to believe and affirm that the fountains of justice were corrupted, and that the law would now give its sanction to any measures, however arbitrary or unconstitutional.

These motives of discontent were further increased by the fervour of religious enthusiasm. The king, by the advice of Laud, archbishop of Canterbury, a prelate of great indiscretion, had relaxed the penalties against Catholics, or allowed them to be commuted for pecuniary fines. Laud had likewise introduced into the church discipline some insignificant changes, such as re-placing the communion-table at the east end of the church, and the priests using an embroidered vestment—circumstances which were represented as a certain prelude to the entire re-introduction of the superstitions of Rome.

It was extremely imprudent in Charles to venture at this time, likewise, upon religious innovations with his subjects of Scotland. James had with some success established in that country a hierarchy on the pattern of the English church, and Charles wanted to complete the work of his father, by resting discipline upon a regular system of canons, and modelling the public worship by the forms of a liturgy. These designs were extremely odious to the Scots, and they met with the reception which might have been expected. The bishop of Edinburgh beginning to read the service in the cathedral-church, was assaulted with the most furious rage, and narrowly escaped being torn in pieces by the populace. The tumult spread through the whole kingdom, and the heads of the Presbyterian party, assembling themselves in the capital, subscribed the famous bond called the *National Covenant*, by which, after a formal renunciation of the abominations of popery, they bound themselves by a solemn oath to resist all religious innovations, and to defend to the utmost the glory of God, and the honour of their king and country. The consequences of this association, which was eagerly subscribed by all ranks

and conditions of the people, were extremely alarming; and Charles, perceiving he had gone too far, offered to suspend the use of the liturgy, provided matters were put on the same footing as before, and the Scots would retract their covenant. But they replied that they would sooner renounce their baptism; and summoning a general assembly at Glasgow, they, with great deliberation, not only annulled the liturgy and canons, but utterly abolished the episcopal hierarchy, which, for above thirty years, had quietly subsisted in the kingdom.

To maintain this violent procedure, it was very soon perceived that there would be a necessity of having recourse to arms, and the Scots commenced hostilities by seizing and fortifying the most important places of strength in the kingdom. To quell these disorders in Scotland, Charles, much against his inclination, found it absolutely necessary again to assemble his parliament. But this assembly, after an interruption of eleven years, seemed to meet with the same spirit as that which had occasioned their dissolution. Instead of supplies, the king heard of nothing but the grievances of *tunnage* and *poundage*, and the *ship-money*, and violent complaints against the arbitrary jurisdiction of the *Star-chamber*. With a blind precipitation, Charles dissolved this parliament as he had done the preceding—a measure which he ought to have foreseen might well increase, but could never contribute to remove, the discontents of the people. The Scots, in the meantime, having penetrated into the heart of England, and still professing great duty and loyalty, while they were committing the most determined acts of hostility, the king saw himself once more reduced to the necessity of calling a new parliament, his *fifth* and *last*.

The time was come when those disputes, which for many years had been violently fermenting in the nation, had attained their utmost crisis. Charles now saw, when it was too late, that the torrent was irre-

sistible, and he resolved to give it way. This parliament began, like all the others, by bringing forward a complicated catalogue of grievances. The tunnage and poundage was aimed at among the rest; a bill was prepared, expressly granting this duty for the period only of two months; and fixing, in the strongest and most positive terms, the right of parliament alone to bestow it. It was passed by the king without hesitation. Monopolies of every kind were abolished; and all who were concerned in them, as well as in levying the ship-money, were fined as delinquents. A bill was brought in for the regular summoning of parliament every third year: this bill, a most important concession, likewise received the royal assent. Encouraged by these successful experiments of their power, a heavier blow was yet meditated against the sovereign, in the impeachment of his favourite minister, the earl of Strafford. By a concurrence of accidents, this nobleman laboured under the odium of all the three nations of the British empire. The Scots regarded him as the adviser of all the measures obnoxious to that country; the Irish, whom he had governed as lord lieutenant, had found him extremely arbitrary; and, with the English, at least the parliamentary leaders, it was sufficient cause of hatred that, having begun public life as an assertor of the popular claims, he had in maturer age become the chief friend and counsellor of the king.

Strafford was impeached; for against an unpopular minister it is easy to form articles of impeachment. Laud, the archbishop of Canterbury, was, in like manner, arraigned for treason, and both committed prisoners to the Tower. The great and fundamental charge against them, which was compounded of an infinite number of articles of offence, was the design which the Commons supposed to have been formed by their counsel and advice, of subverting the laws and constitution of the kingdom, and introducing arbitrary and unlimited authority.

Strafford was brought to trial; he defended himself with great ability. The charge upon the whole was certainly relevant; but though it was apparent he had acted with great intemperance and indiscretion, nothing was proved which was sufficient to justify a penal conclusion. His enemies now found it necessary to attempt a new mode of prosecution, and this was the most unjustifiable part of their procedure. A bill of attainder was brought into the House of Commons, in which the principal proof adduced of Strafford's guilt was a scrap of paper in the handwriting of Sir Henry Vane, consisting of notes taken of a debate in the privy council on the subject of the war against the Scots, in which Strafford was said to have urged the king to go on to levy the ship-money, and to have hinted that he was now absolved from all rules of government. Six counsellors, together with Vane, had been present at this debate. Four of these declared that they recollected no such expressions of Strafford; the other two could give no evidence, as one had left the country and the other was a state-prisoner. Vane's evidence, therefore, stood single and unsupported; yet a majority of the Commons passed the bill of attainder; and the Peers, intimidated by these violent and desperate measures, which made every man tremble for his own safety, choosing most of them to absent themselves from parliament, the bill was likewise, by a slender majority, carried through the upper house.

It remained now to obtain the royal assent. The populace flocked in thousands around the palace, crying loud for justice. Alarms were spread through the city of Popish conspiracies, invasions, and insurrections. Open threats were uttered of the vengeance of God and man against all who protected or opposed the punishment of the guilty. The king's servants declined giving counsel or advice. The queen, terrified with these violent and increasing tumults, pressed him, with tears, to satisfy the demands of the people.

Strafford himself (a singular instance of generosity and greatness of mind,) wrote to him, entreating that, for the sake of public peace and to compose these fatal misunderstandings between the king and people, his life might be made a sacrifice.

Charles, after a conflict too severe for his fortitude, granted a commission to four noblemen to give the royal assent to the bill of attainder—a step, which to the last moment of his life, he never forgave himself. The Commons, taking advantage of the agony of his mind on this trying occasion, which left no room for just or cool reflection, laid hold of that opportunity to obtain his assent to a bill which rendered the parliament perpetual, which declared that they should not be dissolved, prorogued, or adjourned without their own consent. Strafford was beheaded on Tower Hill.

Thus the present parliament discovered a design which the preceding had either never fully entertained, or most carefully disguised. Hitherto most of the proceedings of the Commons had the sanction of a real regard for the interests of the kingdom, and a patriotic endeavour to fix the constitution on the firm basis of the liberties of the subject. The arbitrary measures of the crown had been, with great propriety, opposed; and a most beneficial effect had ensued of limiting an excessive and dangerous prerogative which, in some of the former reigns, had been so enlarged as in fact to render the sovereign absolute and independent of his parliament. In this reign, by a laudable and vigorous resistance, the Commons had obtained such concessions from the crown as fixed the constitution nearly upon the same equal principles on which it stands at this day: so far they had acted the part of patriots and friends to their country; but from this period their designs are not reducible to the same laudable principle. The last bill of the Commons had rendered the parliament perpetual—a measure which, in fact, annihilated the English constitution, by destroying that just equilibrium upon which its exist-

ence depends; and we shall now see the consequences of that decisive step, the plan pursued to its final accomplishment in the total extinction of the monarchical government.

Ireland, during these transactions, exhibited a scene of horror and bloodshed. The Irish Roman Catholics had judged these turbulent times a fit season for asserting the independence of their country, and shaking off the English yoke. From a detestable abuse of the two best of motives, *religion* and *liberty*, they were incited to one of the most horrible attempts recorded in the annals of history. They conspired to assassinate, in one day, all the Protestants in Ireland, and the design was hardly surmised in England till above forty thousand had been put to the sword.

To extinguish this dreadful rebellion, the king solicited the aid of the parliament, and committed to them the charge of the war. They immediately laid hold of that offer, which they interpreted in its most ample sense, as implying a transference to them of the whole military and executive power of the crown. Troops were levied with the utmost industry and alacrity, arms provided, and all military stores furnished from the royal magazines; a measure which served two most important purposes, to disarm the king and to arm themselves. The Irish rebellion, the ostensible motive, was but slightly attended to, while schemes of much more consequence were in agitation at home. There was nothing now required but a cause for an open rupture, and that was not long wanting.

The Commons found a considerable opposition to the extreme violence of their measures from the House of Peers. It was therefore necessary that some course should be taken to bring *them* to a more perfect acquiescence. Some of the bishops having presented a formal complaint to parliament that the insults of the populace endangered their lives, and protested against all proceedings in the upper house which might be held in their absence, the Commons

framed an impeachment of the whole bench of bishops, as endeavouring to subvert the constitution of parliament, and they were all committed to custody.

These measures had the effect for which, it is presumable, they were intended. The patience of Charles was entirely exhausted, and he was impelled to a violent exertion of authority. The attorney-general by the king's command, impeached five members of the House of Commons, among whom were John Hampden, Pym, and Holles, the chiefs of the popular party. A sergeant being sent, without effect, to demand them of the Commons, the king, to the surprise of everybody, went in person to the house to seize them. They had notice of his intention, and had withdrawn. The Commons justly proclaimed this attempt a breach of privilege. The streets re-echoed with the clamours of the populace, and a general insurrection was prognosticated. The king acknowledged his error by an humiliating message to the house; but the submission was as ineffectual as the violence had been imprudent.

The spirits of the people were now wound up to their highest pitch. War was the last resource; and the signal was soon given for its commencement by a new bill of the Commons, naming the governors and lieutenants of all the fortified places, and making them responsible for their conduct to the parliament alone. The next step was to assume the whole *legislative power*, which was done by a new vote, making it a breach of privilege to dispute the law of the land declared by the Lords and Commons.

Counter-manifestoes were now published on the part of the king and of the parliament. It is remarkable that in one of those upon the part of the king, the constitution is represented as a mixture of three forms of government—the monarchical, the aristocratical, and democratical; an idea which, perhaps, Charles, in his high notions of an arbitrary prerogative, would not have admitted in the beginning of his

reign, and which now, by a strange vicissitude of opinions, was virtually denied by his parliament, who assumed to *themselves, independent of the king*, the whole legislative and executive authority of government.

The royal cause was supported by almost all the nobility, a great portion of the men of landed property, all the members of the church of England, and all the Catholics of the kingdom. The parliament had on their side the city of London, and the inhabitants of most of the great towns. I will not enter into a minute detail of this calamitous civil war. The first military operations were favourable to the king; he was aided by his nephew, Prince Rupert, son of the unfortunate Elector Palatine. The parliamentarians were defeated in the battles of Worcester and Edgehill. The queen, who inherited a considerable portion of the spirit of her father, the great Henry IV. of France, brought to the aid of her husband money, troops, arms, artillery, and ammunition, from the continent. She had raised money even by the sale of her own jewels and effects. The first campaign, on the whole, was favourable to the royalists; though they were defeated in the battle of Newbury, in which Charles lost one of his best counsellors and ablest partisans, Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland, a man of superior talents, and whose virtues were equal to his abilities. He had formerly, with the most laudable zeal for the interests of the subject, stood foremost in all attacks on the high prerogative of the crown; but he wished to reform, not to destroy, the constitution; and, with the same noble ardour with which he had resisted the first tyrannical exertions of the monarch, he now supported Charles in those limited powers which yet remained to him: he pursued the straight and onward path, equally remote from either extreme—a beautiful model of the most exalted and virtuous patriotism.

To strengthen their cause by the active assistance

of the Scots, the parliament, of whom the greatest part were inclined to the presbyterian form of discipline, now expressed their desire for ecclesiastical reformation and the abolition of hierarchy. Commissioners were appointed to treat with the king to adopt the Scottish mode of ecclesiastical worship, and others despatched to Scotland with powers to enter into a strict confederacy in the articles of religion and politics. The Solemn League and Covenant was framed at Edinburgh, in which both parties bound themselves, by oath, to extirpate popery, prelacy, and profane ceremonies, and to reform the two kingdoms according to the word of God, and on the model of the purest churches; to maintain the privileges of king and parliament, and to bring to justice all incendiaries and malignants. In consequence of this confederacy, twenty thousand Scots took the field, and marched into England to co-operate with the parliamentary forces.

The celebrated Oliver Cromwell, who had hitherto made no figure, began now to distinguish himself. A sect had lately sprung up who termed themselves Independents. They held the Presbyterians in as great abhorrence as those of the church of England. They pretended to immediate inspiration from heaven; rejected all ecclesiastical establishments; disdained all creeds and systems of belief; and despising every distinction of governors and governed, held all men, king, nobility, and commons, to be upon a level of equality. Of this sect, Cromwell was one of the chief leaders. He was a person of a rude and uncultivated, but a very superior genius; a man whose peculiar dexterity lay in discovering the characters, and taking advantage of the weaknesses, of mankind. He was in religion at once an enthusiast and a hypocrite; in political matters, both a leveller and a tyrant; and in common life, cautious, subtle, and circumspect, at the same time that he was daring and impetuous. With these qualities, Oliver Cromwell acquired such superiority

as to attain the command of the parliament and of the kingdom.

By the interest of Cromwell and his party, Sir Thomas Fairfax was chosen general of the parliamentary forces—a man over whom he had an absolute ascendant, and under whom he himself immediately took the command of a regiment of horse.

The royal cause, in the meantime, had met with some success in Scotland from the great military abilities of the marquis of Montrose; but matters in England wore a different aspect. The royal army was totally defeated in the battle of Naseby. This victory was decisive.. With the shattered remains of his troops, the king retired to Oxford, and on the point of being besieged, while he lay between the Scots and English armies, he came to the resolution of putting himself into the hands of the Scots, who, he still flattered himself, as his countrymen, had yet some regard for his person and authority; but here he was disappointed. Equally inveterate and inflamed, and at this time dependant upon the English for indemnifying them in the charges of the war, they made no scruple to deliver up Charles to the parliament, who cheerfully paid all their demands of arrears.

The war was now at an end; but the views of Cromwell were only in their first opening. The parliament, who had no further occasion for the army, now thought of disbanding them; but Cromwell and the troops had no such inclination. The king was in the hands of the commissioners of parliament, and Cromwell without waiting for the general's orders, despatched a party of five hundred horse, who seized the king's person, and brought him safe to the army. The parliament was thrown into the utmost consternation, which was redoubled when they beheld Cromwell, now chosen general, march to within a few miles of the city of London. His design was not long ambiguous. He caused eleven members of the House of Commons, chiefs of the Presbyterian party, to

be impeached for high treason; and afterward entering the city, where all was uproar and confusion, he ordered the Lord mayor and chief magistrates to prison. The speakers of the two houses surrendered, and put themselves under the army's protection. The parliament was now at their mercy, and they had in their hands the king and the whole authority of the government.

The king, who now saw this spirit of the army directed so strenuously against his enemies, began to believe himself in the hands of his friends; but he was miserably deceived. Cromwell had determined the destruction both of king and parliament. The eyes of Charles were soon opened to his situation. Rumours were artfully propagated of designs against his life, of which the intention was to force him to attempt an escape from his confinement. They had the desired effect; he found means to escape from Hampton Court, and to fly to the Isle of Wight, where he was forthwith detained a close prisoner.

Here a negotiation was begun between the king and parliament, which, from the concessions made by Charles, had, at first, every appearance of terminating this state of anarchy. He agreed to resign to the parliament the power over the militia and army, and the right of raising money for their support. He agreed to abolish episcopacy; and that for three years the Presbyterian form of worship should take place; after which, a lasting plan should be settled by the advice of parliament. He resigned the disposal of all the offices of state, and the power of creating peers without consent of parliament. In short he acquiesced in all their demands; two articles only excepted: to give up his friends to punishment, and to abandon his own religious principles.

After a debate of three days, the parliament, of whom a great majority were now most sincerely desirous of an accommodation, passed a vote, by which it was declared that the king's concessions were a

reasonable foundation for the house to proceed upon in the settlement of the kingdom. The vote was no sooner heard, than Cromwell marched into London, surrounded the house of Commons, and suffering none to enter but his own party, excluded about two hundred of the members. Thus there remained about sixty of the Independent party, sure and unanimous in their intended measures. The vote agreeing to the king's concessions was now rescinded, and another passed, declaring it treason in a king to levy war against his parliament, and appointing a high court of justice to take trial of *Charles's treason*. This vote being sent up to the House of Lords, was rejected without a dissenting voice. But this mockery of a parliament was not thus to be stopped in their career. The next vote was that the commons of England have the supreme authority of the nation, independent of either king or peers. Cromwell himself was ashamed of the glaring illegality of these proceedings, and apologized for his conduct by declaring that he had a divine impulse that the king had been abandoned by Heaven.

Thus sixty fanatical Independents, who had the assurance to term themselves the Commons of England, and to arrogate the supreme authority of the nation, prepared a spectacle for the astonishment of all Europe. The king was brought to trial. With great dignity of demeanour, and with high propriety, he refused to ratify the authority of this illegal tribunal by answering to those charges of which he was accused, but offered to vindicate publicly his conduct to his subjects and to the world. A few witnesses being called, who swore to his having appeared in arms against the forces of the parliament, sentence was passed, condemning him to be beheaded. Without regard to the remonstrances of France, of Holland, and of now repenting Scotland, or to the judgment formed of these proceedings by all the European nations, this sentence was carried into effect, and Charles fell by

the stroke of an executioner on the 30th day of January, 1649.

From this event, the fate of Charles I., two questions naturally arise: the one, whether it is, in any case, lawful for the subject to carry resistance so far as to employ the sword against the sovereign, or to bring him to justice as a delinquent; the other, whether, in the particular case of Charles, his subjects were justifiable in that procedure.

As to the first question, I hold the principle of *resistance* to be inherent in all government; because it is consonant to human nature, and results from the nature of government itself. Government is founded either on *superior force*, which subjects everything to the despotic will of the governor, or it is founded on a *compact*, *express*, or *tacit*, by which the subject consents to be ruled, and the prince to rule, according to certain laws and regulations. In the former case of a government founded on force, resistance is implied in the very idea of such a constitution; and force is lawfully employed to dissolve a connexion which owed its existence to force. In the case of a government subsisting by an express or tacit agreement between the prince and subjects, while the prince maintains his part of the contract by a strict adherence to those rules by which it is stipulated that he is to govern, resistance is unlawful and rebellious; where he violates those rules, resistance is legal and justifiable. In all governments, therefore, the principle of resistance is naturally inherent; and if that is allowed, I see nothing that can, or that ought, to limit it in degree, till its purpose is accomplished.

With regard to the second question, whether, in the case of Charles, the subjects were justifiable in carrying their resistance so far as to put the sovereign to death, neither do I apprehend it difficult to form a precise opinion. The narrative I have given of the transactions of this reign, leads to a conclusion which is equally remote from either extreme, equally con-

demnatory of the opinions of the bigoted supporters of arbitrary power, and the furious partisans of the rights of the people. The many violations of the constitution by Charles I. (whether he understood them to be such or not is nothing to the purpose) unquestionably justified that resistance on the part of the people, which at length produced its effect in obtaining such concessions from the sovereign as afforded the utmost possible liberty to the subject, consistent with the idea of a limited monarchy. But, from the moment that end was attained, resistance ceased to be lawful. It could have nothing else for its object than the destruction of the constitution. In the case of Charles, the sovereign, taught by severe experience that the people had rights which, when arbitrarily infringed, they had strength to vindicate, at length not only gave them back their own, but yielded so much of his lawful and constitutional authority as to leave himself little more than the name and shadow of royalty. To insist on a further abasement was illegal and inhuman; to push revenge the length of a *capital punishment*, was a degree of criminality for which there is not an adequate term of blame.

Such are the reflections which would naturally arise on this subject in an impartial breast, upon the supposition that Charles I. had been brought to trial and condemned to death by the authority of the *people of England*, or a fair representation of them in parliament. But let it not be forgotten *who* were those that took upon them to act in the name of the people of England, and what was the nature of that parliament which authorized his trial and condemnation—a handful of fanatics, who, after expelling two hundred of the members of parliament, the people's lawful representatives, annulling a vote of the house which agreed to the king's concessions, passing another vote which declared the house of Peers a useless branch of the constitution, assumed to themselves the whole legislative and executive authority of government. The

perversion of that man's understanding must be deplorable indeed, who, professing himself an advocate for the rights of mankind, holds *these* to be laudable exertions of virtue and of patriotism.

CHAPTER XXX.

COMMONWEALTH OF ENGLAND, REIGNS OF CHARLES II. AND JAMES II.:—Charles II. acknowledged King in Scotland and Ireland—Marquis of Montrose—Cromwell defeats the Scots at Dunbar—Battle of Worcester—Navigation Act—Cromwell dissolves the Parliament by violence, and puts an end to the Republic—Barebones Parliament—Cromwell named Lord Protector—His successful Administration—Death—Richard his son resigns the Protectorate—the Rump Parliament—Disunion in the Council of Officers—General Monk—Charles II. proclaimed—Profuse and voluptuous Reign—War with Holland and France—Plague and Fire of London—Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle—Alarms of Popery—Titus Oates—Bill excluding the Duke of York from the Crown—Habeas Corpus Act—Distinction of Whig and Tory first used—Conspiracy of Russell, Sidney, and Monmouth—Death of Charles—James II.—Monmouth beheaded—Violent measures of James excite the disgust of all Parties—William, Prince of Orange—James escapes to the Continent—Crown settled on the Prince and Princess of Orange—Declaration fixing the Constitution.

THAT select assembly of sixty or seventy fanatical Independents, which styled itself a parliament, having passed a vote which abolished the House of Peers as a useless part of the constitution, began to think of framing some rules and forms for the administration of the government; and the more disinterested friends to liberty were soothed for some time with their favourite system, a republic. The Scots, however, of whom the great majority had yet an attachment to monarchy, and who had sufficient reason for being

disgusted at the conduct of the Independents to the English Presbyterians, determined to acknowledge the son of the late monarch for their lawful sovereign, and with the consent of parliament they proclaimed Charles II. king; but on the express condition of his subscribing the Solemn League and Covenant. Ireland recognised him without any conditions.

The Scots, while they were thus inviting Charles to take possession of one of his paternal kingdoms, gave an example of that cruel and detestable fanatic spirit, which to their shame they seem to have possessed at this time above every other nation. James Graham, marquis of Montrose, a man whose heroism and singular endowments of mind would have rendered him an honour to any age or nation, had, in the latter years of the late monarch, distinguished himself in many successful attempts, both in Scotland and in England, in favour of the royal cause. After the king's captivity, when the war was at end, he had, at his sovereign's command, laid down his arms and retired into France. Upon the king's death, with the aid of some foreign troops, he landed in the north of Scotland, with the purpose of reducing the party of the Convenanters, and establishing the authority of Charles II. upon a constitutional basis, independent of those servile conditions which that party was desirous of imposing on him. He expected to be joined by a large body of the Highlanders, but he found the whole country fatigued with the recent disorders, and much indisposed to renew hostilities. In the meantime, he was suddenly attacked by a large body of the Convenanters, and taken by surprise with an inferior force, he was defeated and made prisoner. His fate was attended with every circumstance of insolence and cruelty, which distinguishes revenge in the meanest souls. He died upon a gibbet, and his limbs were distributed through the principal cities of the kingdom. This was *he* whom one of the most penetrating judges of character (the cardinal de Retz, who inti-

mately knew him) declares to have been one of those heroes of whom there are no longer any remains in the world, and who are only to be met with in the narratives of ancient history.

Meantime, Charles, who had no other resource, betook himself to Scotland, and was obliged, however unwillingly, to accede to every condition that was proposed to him. Fairfax, general of the parliament, had resigned all command of the army, and Cromwell, who was now commander-in-chief, after a successful expedition into Ireland to quell the party of the royalists in that country, marched with sixteen thousand men into Scotland, against his old friends and allies the Covenanters, who, now that Charles had subscribed to their terms, had become his firm adherents. They were much superior to Cromwell's army in number of their troops, but were as much inferior in point of discipline. They were defeated at Dunbar in a decisive engagement; and Charles, soon after retreating into England in hopes to unite the royalists in that country in his favour, Cromwell immediately followed, and attacking the royal army at Worcester, then extremely inconsiderable in their numbers, cut them entirely to pieces. Charles fled in disguise through the western counties of England, continually pursued, encountering for above forty days a most romantic series of dangers and difficulties, and often relying for safety on the meanest peasants, whose fidelity he found unshaken, notwithstanding the immense rewards which were offered for his discovery. At length he found a vessel which conveyed him to the coast of France.

Cromwell, in the meantime, returned in triumph to London. The republican parliament began now to make their government truly respectable, by the greatness of those designs which they formed, and the vigour with which they pursued them. A scheme was proposed to the states of Holland upon the death of the Stadtholder William II., for a union and coa-

lition between the two republics. It was not relished by the Dutch, who were better pleased to maintain their own independence; and the parliament of England, piqued at their refusal, immediately declared war against them. The *navigation act* was passed, which prohibited all foreigners from importing into England in their ships any commodity which was not the growth or manufacture of their own country; an act which struck heavily against the Dutch, because their country produces few commodities; and their commerce consists chiefly in being the factors of other nations. This statute was in another way beneficial to the English, by obliging them to cultivate maritime commerce, from which they have derived the greatest part of their national wealth. In this war, which was most ably maintained on both sides—under Blake, the English admiral, and Van Tromp and de Ruyter, admirals of the Hollanders—the English, on the whole, had a clear superiority; the Dutch were cut off entirely from the commerce of the Channel; their fisheries were totally suspended, and above sixteen hundred of their ships fell into the hands of the English.

The parliament, glorying in these successes, which were so much to the honour of the republic, began to find themselves independent of Cromwell and the army, and determined on a reduction of the land forces, which, while they found themselves so powerful at sea, were only an unnecessary burden upon the nation. This measure, which would have been fatal to the ambition of Cromwell, was prevented by him in a most extraordinary manner. Many circumstances had of late been observed, which discovered the selfish aims of this ambitious man; yet so great was his influence with the army, that he readily found agents to co-operate with him in every scheme which he proposed.

Calling a council of his officers, a remonstrance was framed, to be presented to the parliament, reminding them that it was averse to the spirit of a democracy

that any set of magistrates should be perpetual, and desiring that they might immediately think of dissolving, after issuing writs for the election of a new parliament. This application, it may be imagined, met with a sharp reply, which was nothing more than what Cromwell wished and expected. Before the smallest hint had transpired of his design, he now presented himself with three hundred soldiers at the door of the House of Commons. Leaving his guards without, he took his seat for some time, and listened to their debates; then rising hastily up—"I judge," said he, "this parliament to be ripe for a dissolution." Taking one of the members by the cloak: "*you*," said he, "are a debauchee;" to another, "you are a drunkard;" and to a third, "you are an extortioner. The Lord hath done with you, get you gone, you are no longer a parliament." Then stamping with his foot, which was a signal for the soldiers to enter—"*Here*," said he, pointing to the mace which lay on the table, "take away that fool's bauble;" then ordering the soldiers to drive the whole members out of the house, he locked the door himself, put the key into his pocket, and went home to his lodgings in Whitehall. Thus, by one of the boldest actions recorded in history, the famous republic of England, which had subsisted four years and three months, was annihilated in one moment. This measure, which drew upon Oliver Cromwell the execrations of the violent partisans of liberty, as it dispelled that fine delusion of a patriotic motive, to which they would gladly have attributed the extinction of monarchy in the person of Charles, was regarded by the friends of the constitution with high satisfaction; and they now made the most flattering comments on the necessary instability and fundamental weakness of all systems of government which owe their existence to force and violence.

Yet Cromwell, thus become absolute master of the whole power, civil and military, of the three kingdoms, thought it necessary to leave the nation some

shadow, some phantom of liberty. It was proper that there should be the appearance of a parliament; and he therefore, by the advice of his council of officers, summoned one hundred and twenty-eight persons from the different towns and counties of England, five from Scotland, and six from Ireland, to assemble at Westminster, with power to exercise legislative authority for fifteen months. These, who were chiefly a set of low fanatics, were in scorn denominated by the people Barebones's Parliament, from the name of one of their most violent and active members, Praisegod Barebones, a leather-seller. This assembly, whose shameful ignorance, meanness, and absurdity of conduct rendered them useless and contemptible both to Cromwell and the nation, voluntarily dissolved themselves by a vote, after a session of five months. A few of the members who dissented from this measure continuing to occupy the House of Commons, Cromwell sent one of his officers to turn them out. This officer, a Colonel White, entering the house, demanded what they were doing there: the chairman answered, "They were seeking the Lord."—"Then," said White, "you may go elsewhere, for to my certain knowledge the Lord has not been here these many years;" so saying, he turned them out of doors. Thus the supreme power became now vested in the council of officers. These, who were at Cromwell's absolute disposal, nominated him Lord Protector of the three kingdoms. He was installed in the palace of Whitehall, declared to hold his office for life, and an instrument was prepared, granting to him the right of making peace, war, and alliances, and authorizing a standing army to be kept up of thirty thousand men for the support of government. He was obliged by the same instrument to assemble a parliament every three years. Thus the nation found that, after all their struggles, they had only exchanged one master for another, and in point of real freedom, it was confessed by the partisans of revolu-

tion themselves, that this change was nothing for the better.

The administration of Cromwell was arbitrary, vigorous, and spirited; the nation was loaded with enormous taxes; but the national character was high and respectable. He finished the war with Holland, and compelled the Dutch to yield to the English the honour of the flag, besides obliging them to pay to the East India Company eighty-five thousand pounds, as a compensation for their losses. The glory of the English arms at sea was nobly sustained by Blake—a zealous republican, indeed, and consequently an enemy of all usurped power—but a man who loved his country, and knew that his duty called him to maintain its interest, whatever might be the state of its government.

Yet amid these successes abroad, the Protector found his situation at home extremely uneasy. His parliaments were refractory, and he was often obliged to have recourse to the violent method of excluding, by a guard at the door, such of the members as he knew to be disaffected to him. At length, by using every art to influence the elections, and to fill the house with his sure friends, he got one parliament so perfectly to his mind, that a vote was proposed and passed for investing the Protector with the dignity of *King*, and a committee was appointed to confer with him on that subject, and overcome any scruples which he might have on that score. But Cromwell's scruples were not violent;* he had other objections than what

* It appears, from a very curious conversation, which took place *four* years before this vote of the parliament, between Cromwell and Whitelocke, (reported by the latter in his Memorials,) that Cromwell was most earnestly desirous of the title of king; and that, although he put that desire chiefly on the ground of uniting the discordant councils and controlling the factions of the parliamentary leaders, it was chiefly the motive of his own personal safety, and the security of his usurped power, that in reality influenced him to desire that title and dignity. The following is a short part of that most

proceeded from his own inclinations. He dreaded the resentment of the army. A majority of the officers had signed a remonstrance against this measure; and

extraordinary conversation. Cromwell takes Whitelocke aside, and begins by complimenting him highly, both on his wisdom and abilities, and on his firm attachment and fidelity to himself. Then he pictures, in strong words, the instability of that power which their party had, with so much labour and expense of blood, acquired; that the army was divided into factions, and hostile to the parliament; and that the latter seemed to have no other aim than to engross for their own members all offices of honour or profit; while, being the supreme power, they were under no control and liable to no account. "In short," adds Cromwell, "there is no hope of a good settlement, but, on the contrary, a great deal of fear, that what the Lord hath done so graciously for them and us will be all again destroyed: we all forget God, and God will forget us and give us up to confusion; and these men will help it on if they be suffered to proceed in their ways: some course must be thought on to curb and restrain them, *or we shall be ruined by them.*"

"Whitelocke.—We ourselves have acknowledged them the supreme power, and taken our commissions and authority from them; and how to restrain and curb them after this, it will be hard to find out a way for it.

"Cromwell.—*What if a man should take upon him to be king?*

"Whitelocke.—I think that remedy would be worse than the disease.

"Cromwell.—Why think you so?

"Whitelocke.—As to your own person, the title of king would be of no advantage, because you have the full kingly power in you already, concerning the militia, as you are general. As to the nomination of civil officers, those whom you think fittest are seldom refused, and although you have no negative voice in the passing of law, yet what you dislike will not easily be carried; and the taxes are already settled, and in you power to dispose the money raised. As to foreign affairs, though the ceremonial application be to the parliament, yet the expectation of good or bad success is from your Excellency; and particular solicitations of foreign ministers are made to you only. So that I apprehend, indeed, less envy and danger and pomp, but not less power and real opportunities of doing good in your being general than would be if you had assumed the title of king.

it was reported that many of them had entered into an engagement to put him to death if ever he should accept the crown. Even his own family, his son-in-law and brother-in-law, entreated him to refuse that dangerous office, and threatened to resign their commissions and withdraw themselves from his service. At length Cromwell, with much reluctance, was obliged to refuse that dignity which he most anxiously desired, and had taken such uncommon measures to attain.* To console him for this mortifying disap-

"Cromwell.—I have heard some of your profession observe, that he who is actually king, (whether by election or by descent,) yet being once king, all acts done by him as king are lawful and justifiable, as by any king who hath the crown by inheritance from his forefathers; and that by an act of parliament in Henry VII.'s time, it is safer for those who act under a king, be his title what it will, than for those who act under any other power. And surely the power of a king is so great and high, and so universally understood and reverenced by the people of this nation, that the title of it might not only indemnify, in a great measure, those that act under it, but likewise be of great use and advantage in such times as these to curb the insolence of those whom the present powers cannot control."

Whitelocke replies, that whatever truth there may be in this in general, the assumption of this title by Cromwell would be attended with danger both to himself and his friends; that he would lose the favour of the whole of the republican party; and as the question would come simply to be whether Stuart or Cromwell should be king, a new civil war would follow, and the great majority would side with the ancient line. Finally, he proposes that Cromwell should make a treaty with Charles, and secure for himself as high a station as he chose, while such bounds might be set to the monarchical authority as would be best for the nation's liberties. In conclusion Whitelocke adds, that Cromwell seemed displeased with this counsel, and that his carriage towards him was altered from that time, and he not long after found an opportunity to send him out of the way by an honourable employment, that he might be no obstacle to his ambitious designs.—*Whitelocke's Memorials*, Anno 1652.

* The following anecdote, which rests on the authority of Harry Neville, one of the council of state, is found in the life of that author. Cromwell having a design to set up himself

pointment, the parliament confirmed his title of Protector, to which they added a perpetual revenue, and the right of appointing his successor. They gave him authority likewise to name a house of peers, and he issued writs to sixty members, among whom were five or six of the old nobility, some gentlemen of family and fortune, and the rest officers who had risen from the meanest professions. But none of the old nobility would deign to accept of a seat in this motley assembly; and by naming so many of his friends to sit in the upper house, the Protector found he had lost the majority in the House of Commons, which now began to dispute and traverse all his measures. Enraged at his disappointment, he hastily dissolved this parliament, as he had done several of the preceding.

At length, a prey to disquietude and chagrin, and haunted by continual fears of attempts against his life,*

and bring the crown upon his own head, sent for some of the chief city divines, as if he made it a matter of conscience to be determined by their advice. Among these was the leading Mr. Calamy, who very boldly opposed the project of Cromwell's single government, and offered to prove it both unlawful and impracticable. Cromwell answered readily upon the first head of unlawful, and appealed to the safety of the nation being the supreme law. "But," says he, "pray, Mr. Calamy, why impracticable?" He replied, "Oh, it is against the voice of the nation; there will be nine in ten against you."—"Very well," says Cromwell; "but what if I should disarm the nine, and put the sword in the tenth man's hand—would not that do the business?"

* The situation of Cromwell some time before his death was extremely disquieting. The lawfulness of putting to death a tyrant was a doctrine that he himself had done his utmost to inculcate; his inordinate ambition preventing him from foreseeing its necessary application to his own usurped authority. A very able pamphlet was published, entitled "Killing no Murder," in which the author propounded three questions for discussion: viz., 1st. Whether the Lord Protector was a tyrant: 2d. If he be, whether it be lawful to do justice upon him without solemnity; that is, to kill him: 3d. If it be lawful, whether it is likely to prove profitable to the Common

the tumult of his mind gradually preyed upon a strong bodily constitution, and brought on a mortal disease, of which he died, on the 3d of September, 1658.

He had nominated his son Richard to succeed him in the protectorate, a man in every respect opposite to his father; of no genius, ability, or judgment; and possessed of mild and humane dispositions. He was, from the beginning of his government, the sport of factions. He was unable either to command respect from the army, or compliance from the parliament. Some of the principal officers, among whom was his own brother-in-law, Fleetwood, formed cabals against his authority, and went so far as to demand, in an imperious manner, that he would dissolve his parliament, and trust solely to his council of officers. Richard had the weakness to comply with their request, and he dismissed that assembly which was the sole support of his pitiful authority. He found now that he was virtually dethroned, and he soon after signed his demission in form. His brother Henry, who was lord-lieutenant of Ireland, a man of the same pacific dispositions, soon after imitated his example, and resigned his government; and thus fell at once into their original obscurity the family of the Cromwells, which had raised itself to a height above that of the sovereigns of their country. The council of officers were now possessed of the supreme power; but wishing to show some respect to the remains of a constitution, they collected together as many as could be found of that nominal parliament which had tried and put the king to death. This assembly, grown now

wealth: all which questions were resolved in the affirmative, and the conclusion was enforced with uncommon powers of eloquence and of argument. This book was written by Captain Titus, under the feigned name of William Allen. Cromwell was deeply impressed by this performance; he saw the increasing discontents of the nation, the growing disaffection of the army, and even an alienation of his own kindred and relations. His mind became tortured with anxiety, and a fever of the spirits ensued which terminated his life.

both odious and contemptible, was termed by the people the "Rump Parliament." Its measures giving offence to the council of officers who assembled it, they very speedily dissolved it.

It is scarcely possible to conceive the disorder and anarchy that at this time prevailed universally in the nation. The government of Cromwell, vigorous and spirited as it was, had been in the main very prejudicial to the solid interests of the kingdom. The national taxes during his administration had, one year with another, amounted to twelve millions sterling; a sum to which never anything nearly equal had been hitherto raised by the crown. His expenses for spies and secret intelligence are estimated at no less than sixty thousand pounds sterling a year. He left upon the nation above two millions of debt, though he found in the treasury above five hundred thousand pounds sterling, and in stores to the amount of seven hundred thousand pounds. The army, which was the main support of his government, and which amounted to sixty thousand, sometimes eighty thousand men, kept in constant pay, was a most expensive drain to the revenue. Upon the death of the Protector, the sole authority of government was in the hands of this standing army, of which the principal leaders began to aim, each for himself, at playing the same part which had raised Cromwell to the supreme power. Matters ran so high, that nothing less than a new civil war was apprehended, and the nation looked forward with despair to a series of calamities which seemed to have no end. In this state of affairs it is not to be wondered at that the great bulk of the people began earnestly to desire the restoration of their ancient form of government.

George Monk, one of Cromwell's generals, commanded at this time the army in Scotland, and by means of that authority he secretly planned the restoration of the exiled monarch, for which he found the most favourable dispositions in the nation. The tyr-

anny of the council of officers becoming every day more intolerable, Monk marched his army into England, and declared that it was his resolution to compose the disorders of the kingdom, by bringing about the election of a free parliament. This measure, which the republican party knew to be equivalent to calling back the king, was most violently opposed; but Monk was seconded by the nation, and even the army began to abandon their republican leaders. After every attempt to excite a new civil war, which was their last resource, they were obliged to agree to the proposed measure, and a free parliament was assembled. Here matters did not long remain doubtful, an envoy from Charles having presented a declaration, by which he promised a full indemnity to all his former opponents, with the exception of such as the parliament should name, besides full liberty of conscience; and payment to the troops of all their arrears. The message was received with transports of joy, and Charles II. was proclaimed king amid the universal acclamations of his people, on the 29th of May, 1660.

This period of the Restoration was the proper time to have settled the respective rights of the crown and people upon a fixed and permanent basis, and it was proposed in parliament by some of the wisest and most politic of its members; but the great majority were so impatient, that they could not bear the thoughts of a lengthened negotiation, and blindly chose to repose implicit confidence on their sovereign's good disposition.

The parliament settled on the crown a revenue of twelve hundred thousand pounds. The troops were paid and discharged, and only five thousand men, with some garrisons, were retained, as a standing military force. Eleven regicides, excepted by parliament from the general indemnity, were tried and brought to justice; and these men died with the intrepidity and constancy of martyrs.

The reign of Charles II. was the era of gayety and

splendour, but none of honour to the nation. Never was there a more sudden revolution in the manners of a court than what took place upon the restoration. Instead of that savage gloom, the consequence of fanaticism, and a rude austerity of manners, the new monarch diffused around him an air of ease and merriment, a taste for show and magnificence, and all that relish for luxury and voluptuousness which distinguished the court of France at the same period. But the French monarch, Louis XIV., amid all his relish for luxury and magnificence, was influenced by the prevailing passion of aggrandizing his kingdom and studying the national glory as well as his private pleasures. Charles, on the contrary, voluptuous and prodigal, carried to such a height his love of pleasure as materially to interfere with the cares of government. From a total want of economy, his expenses constantly exceeded his revenue; he was ever dependant and a beggar from his parliaments, and was obliged to recur to expedients dishonourable to the nation to supply the private wants of the crown. After dissipating the portion of his wife Catharine of Portugal, and two hundred thousand crowns which had been given him by France, he sold Dunkirk, in the second year of his reign, to Louis XIV., for four hundred thousand pounds sterling; a transaction no less displeasing to the English than agreeable to the French, to whom that place was a most important acquisition.

A new war was kindled between England and the Dutch, principally from their being rivals in maritime commerce. The House of Commons was desirous of a war, and Charles undertook it, after they had granted him a subsidy larger than had ever been voted, amounting to two millions and a half sterling. By the vigour and prudent foresight of the grand pensionary, John de Witt, the Dutch were in a most formidable state of defence. The English fleet, consisting of one hundred and forty-four sail, was com-

manded by the king's brother, James duke of York; and under him by Prince Rupert and the earl of Sandwich. Louis XIV., then engaged in a defensive alliance with the States, determined to take an active part for their support, and England was now involved in a war both with France and Holland. After several desperate but indecisive engagements, England began to perceive that this war promised nothing but expense and bloodshed. A plague, which was then raging in London, consumed above one hundred thousand of its inhabitants:* a most dreadful fire, happening almost at the same time, had reduced almost the whole of the city to ashes; and amid so many calamities it was not wonderful that the warlike ardour of the nation should be considerably abated. A negotiation was carried on at Breda, and a peace was concluded between the belligerant powers in 1667. By the treaty of Breda, New York was secured to the English, the isle of Polerone, in the East Indies, to the Dutch, and Acadia, in North America, to the French.

An unsuccessful war is in England constantly attended with strong marks of the public odium to those who are believed to have been its advisers and conductors. The Chancellor Clarendon, a man equally respectable for his virtue and integrity as for his eminent abilities, had at this time fallen under the popular displeasure, as being the king's first minister. It is certain that he had disapproved of the Dutch war, but he had advised the sale of Dunkirk, which was a measure still more odious. He was impeached in the House of Commons for treason, and condemned to perpetual exile. He passed the remainder of his life in France, which he dedicated to the composition of his History of the Civil Wars of England, a work which will live for ever.

* See Account of the Ejected Clergy annexed to the Life of Baxter, by Calamy, vol. iii. pp. 33, 34; where there is a progressive account of the increase and decrease of this dreadful distemper from week to week, during the year 1665.

England, scarcely reconciled to the Dutch, now formed with them, in conjunction with Sweden, a triple alliance to oppose the successes of Louis XIV. against the Spanish monarchy in the Low Countries; and the consequence of this triple alliance was an effectual stop to the victorious career of the French monarch, and the conclusion of the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, in the year 1668.

The domestic administration of Charles II. was far from being tranquil. It was his misfortune to be guided by very bad counsellors. His connexions with France had been extremely disagreeable to the nation; his schemes of absolute government, the favourable disposition he showed to the Catholics, and his allowing himself to be much influenced by the advice of his brother, the duke of York, who was avowedly of that religion—all these circumstances concurred to furnish grounds for complaint and dissatisfaction. The terrors of popery were now revived, and the loudest complaints resounded from all quarters of the kingdom. A bill was brought into parliament for imposing a test-oath on all who should enjoy any public office. They were obliged to take the sacrament in the established church, and to abjure the doctrine of transubstantiation; and, in consequence of this new law, to which the king was obliged to give his consent, his brother James, duke of York, lost his office of high admiral.*

But these concessions did not quiet the general fears and discontents. A worthless impostor, one Titus Oates, who had more than once changed his religion, now set the whole nation in a ferment, by the discovery of a pretended plot of the Catholics. He

* It is a curious fact, that *test-oaths* are as old as the times of the ancient Athenians. Stobæus informs us, that there was a particular law at Athens, obliging every citizen, before his admission to any public office, to take an oath, "that he would defend the altars, and conform himself to the religious rites of his country."

asserted that the pope, claiming the sovereignty of England, had intrusted the exercise of his power to the Jesuits, who had already got patents for the principal offices of the kingdom; that fifty Jesuits had undertaken that the king should be assassinated, and the crown bestowed on the duke of York, who, if he declined it, was likewise to be murdered; that the Jesuits, who it was supposed had already almost reduced London to ashes in the late dreadful fire, had planned another fire and massacre, with which they intended to begin the execution of their project.

These most extraordinary chimeras received, however, some countenance from circumstances. The duke of York's secretary was seized, and among his papers a variety of letters being found between him and the king of France's confessor and the pope's nuncio, which proved nothing else but a very indiscreet zeal for the Romish religion, it was easy to put such constructions on this correspondence as to strengthen Oates's story of the conspiracy. The informer received the thanks of parliament, with a pension of twelve hundred pounds sterling, a reward which was sufficient to incite another villain, one Bedloe, to act the same part, and to add yet more circumstances of horror to this conspiracy, of which his narrative tallied in the main with that of Oates.*

* The following fact shows how much these most astonishing prejudices had affected the minds even of those whose rank in life, education, and professional habits, ought to have more peculiarly removed them from the influence of such impostures. It is given on the authority of Mr. Hooke, the Roman historian. "Lord Chief Justice Scroggs, hearing the testimony of Oates concerning a consultation among the papists in London, at which Oates swore *he was present* himself, disproved, in the fullest manner, by several persons who came over from France for the purpose, and who all swore to their *having seen Oates at St. Omer's on the very day he pretended to have been in London;* to one of them, who, on cross-examination, said 'he was certain Oates was at St. Omer's on that day, if he could believe his own senses,' re-

The popular phrensy was inflamed to the highest pitch, the parliament partook of the general madness, and a new test was proposed, by which popery was declared to be idolatry, and all members who refused this declaration were excluded from both houses. It was but by a majority of two voices that the duke of York was exempted from this test, who entreated, with tears in his eyes, that he might be allowed to exercise his religion in private. The queen was even accused of having intelligence of this conspiracy, of which the object was to murder her husband, and remove herself from the throne.

Amid these inquietudes the king's disgust was further increased by the accusation of the treasurer Danby, on the score of his having sold a peace to France. This was a direct attack upon the king himself, as it stood proved by his handwriting, that Danby's letters in this negotiation were written by his order. To prevent these dangerous scrutinies, Charles thought it his most prudent measure to dissolve the parliament.

A second parliament even went farther than the first. The treasurer was impeached and committed to prison; and a bill passed the House of Commons for excluding the Duke of York from the succession, as being a professed Catholic. The famous act of *Habeas Corpus* was likewise the work of this parliament; one of the chief securities of English liberty. By this excellent statute, the nature of which we shall hereafter more fully consider, it is prohibited to send any one to a prison beyond seas; no judge, under severe penalties, must refuse a prisoner a writ of *habeas corpus*, by which the jailer is directed to produce in court the body of the prisoner, and to certify the cause of his detainer and imprisonment;—every prisoner must be indicted the first term after his com-

plied, that 'all papists were taught not to believe their senses;' and so set aside the testimony of all the witnesses who had sworn to that fact."

mitment, and brought to trial in the subsequent term. A law of this kind, so favourable to the liberty of the subject, takes place in no government except that of Britain,* and even of itself is a sufficient argument of the superiority of our constitution to that of all other governments.

The spirit of faction among the people was, however, daily increasing. The parties of *Whig* and *Tory* now became first known by these epithets. The former were the opposers of the crown against the latter, who were its partisans; and, as in most popular factions, each party had on its side a great deal of right and a great deal of wrong, most of the tory faction would have gone the length of supporting the monarch in the most arbitrary stretches of despotic power; and most of the whigs would gladly have stripped him of all power whatever. But between these two extremes is the line of moderation, a course easy to be seen, but very difficult to be steered; almost impossible to be kept in actions, and extremely difficult even in opinions; for the moderate man must make his account to be a favourite with neither party, but to be often obnoxious to both; and he must be endowed with that strength of mind as to find in his own conscience, and in the approbation of a few, a recompense to balance the entire loss of popular applause.

The party of the *Whigs* seemed predominant in the next parliament, and vengeance was taken on several of the unfortunate catholics, on suspicion of concern in the popish plot. Among these was the Viscount Stafford, an old and venerable peer, who was condemned and executed upon the testimony of Titus Oates and two of his infamous and perjured associates. In the subsequent reign this wicked impostor was convicted of perjury, and condemned to the pillory and perpetual imprisonment, from which he was not released till

* The author must either have been ignorant, or have forgotten, when he wrote this, that there was such a country as these United States.

after the revolution, when his signal services and sufferings were rewarded with a considerable pension.

The king, harassed by this parliament to give his consent to the bill excluding his brother from the throne, had no other expedient but to dissolve them, and he found their successors in the next parliament to be equally violent. To pacify them, he proposed that the duke of York should be banished for life, retaining after his accession only the title of king, while the next heir should govern the kingdom as regent; but this expedient was rejected, and the consequence was a dissolution likewise of this parliament, which was the last that Charles II. assembled.

He now began to adopt an economical system, and to retrench the expenses of the crown. He found his friends increasing in proportion, and was enabled to extend his authority; but still the great cause of dissatisfaction remained: the duke of York was at the bottom of all the measures of government, and his counsels encouraged Charles in his natural propensity to despotism. A conspiracy formed by Shaftesbury, and in which Lord Russell, Algernon Sidney, and the duke of Monmouth, the king's natural son, were concerned, might have overturned the government, had not Shaftesbury, provoked at some unforeseen delays, retired in disgust to Holland. The rest were discovered and betrayed by one of the associates. Russell and Sidney suffered death with great fortitude, and gloried in being the martyrs of the cause of liberty. Monmouth was pardoned, but afterward retracting his confession, was obliged to fly from court.

The discovery of this conspiracy strengthened the power of the crown, and Charles continued to rule till his death with an almost absolute degree of authority. The duke of York without taking the test, resumed his office of high-admiral, and was now tacitly acknowledged by the nation as the successor to the throne. Charles died in the year 1685, in the fifty-fifth year of his age, and twenty-fifth of his reign;

and the duke of York, accordingly, succeeded by the title of James II.

This short and inglorious reign, distinguished by nothing but a series of the most absurd and blind efforts of intemperate zeal, and arbitrary exertions for establishing a despotic authority in the crown, does not merit a long detail.* James was the instrument of his own misfortunes, and ran headlong to destruction. In a government where the people have a determined share of power, and a capacity of legally resisting every measure which they apprehend to be to their disadvantage, every attempt to change, in opposition to their general desire, the religion or civil constitution of the country, must be impracticable. The Roman Catholics in England were not at this time one hundredth of the nation. How absurd, then, (as Sir William Temple told his sovereign,) —how contrary to common sense was it, to imagine that one part should govern ninety-nine who were of opposite sentiments and opinions! Yet James was weak enough to make that absurd and desperate attempt. The nobility of the kingdom, by natural right the counsellors of the sovereign, were obliged to give place to a set of Romish priests, who directed all his measures; and James, as if he was determined to neglect nothing which might tend to his own destruction, began his reign by levying without the au-

* At the beginning of this reign an excellent address was presented to James by the Quakers:—

"These are to testify to thee our sorrow for our friend Charles, whom we hope thou wilt follow in everything that is good. We hear that thou art not of the religion of the land any more than we; and, therefore, may reasonably expect that thou wilt give us the same liberty that thou takest thyself.

"We hope that in this and all things else thou wilt promote the good of thy people, which will oblige us to pray that thy reign over us may be long and prosperous."

It had been happy for the new sovereign had he attended to the equity of this requisition, and to the wisdom of the advice which it conveyed.

thority of parliament all the taxes which had been raised by his predecessor: he showed a further contempt of the constitution and of all national feeling by going openly to mass, and though, in his first parliament, he solemnly promised to observe the laws and to maintain the Protestant religion, he, at the same time, hinted in pretty strong terms, that if he found them at all refractory or backward in granting such supplies as he should require, he could easily dispense with calling any more such assemblies. It was not a little surprising that he found this parliament disposed to receive meekly this first specimen of his despotic disposition, and to grant him all that he required of them.

The duke of Monmouth having entered into a new rebellion, the parliament declared him guilty of high treason, and voted a large sum of money for quelling this insurrection. Monmouth was defeated, made prisoner, and beheaded, and the nation now discovered one particular of the king's disposition with which they had hitherto been unacquainted—a great degree of cruelty and inhumanity. Vast numbers of those unhappy prisoners, who were taken after the defeat of Monmouth, were hanged without any form of trial; and the execrable Judge Jeffreys filled the kingdom with daily executions under the sanction of justice. Many of these trials were attended with the most iniquitous procedure; but all applications to the king for pardon were checked by a declaration, that he had promised to forgive none who should be legally condemned. "When the bench is under the direction of the cabinet, trials are conspiracies, and executions are murders."*

The commons seemed possessed with a spirit of the most abject slavery; the king was proceeding fast to invade every branch of the constitution, and met from them with no resistance; the house of peers, however, taking upon them to examine the dis-

* Ralph's History of England, pref.

pensation given from taking the test-oath, James, who could no longer bear even the shadow of opposition, immediately prorogued the parliament.

This intemperate procedure raised a general alarm; but the king's imprudence knew no bounds, and went on from one exasperating measure to another. The bishop of London was suspended from his ecclesiastical functions, for refusing to censure a clergyman who had preached against the doctrines of the church of Rome. Six other bishops, having refused to publish the king's equally fraudulent as illegal *declaration for liberty of conscience*, were immediately committed to prison. James sent an ambassador to the pope, though all correspondence with Rome was by law treasonable, and he received the pope's nuncio in London, who published pastoral injunctions, and consecrated several Romish bishops. A catholic president was appointed by the king to Magdalen college, Oxford, and on its refusal to admit him, the whole members were expelled except two who complied. In short, the king's intentions were not at all disguised; and the Roman Catholics began openly to boast that a very little time would see their religion fully established.

James had three children, the Princess Mary, who was married to William, prince of Orange, the stadtholder of the united provinces; Anne, married to Prince George of Denmark; and James, an infant, born in the year 1687. The prince of Orange, who, from the time of his father-in-law's accession, began to look toward the crown of England, had kept on good terms with James till the event of the prince of Wales's birth, which was a disappointment to his hopes of succession. He now began to think of securing it by force of arms, to which the misconduct of the king and the discontents of the people gave him the most flattering invitation. While he was employed on the continent in secretly making vigorous preparations for war, his agents and emissaries

secured him a great number of adherents in England. The king had disgusted all parties. The whigs who lamented the loss of the national liberty, and the tories who trembled for the danger of the established church, all joined in a hearty detestation of the measures of the crown.

One singular circumstance was the infatuation of the king, and his total blindness to the progress of those measures both at home and on the continent, which were preparing his immediate downfall. When Louis XIV. apprized him of his danger, and offered to send him the aid of a fleet, and to make a diversion in his favour by invading the united provinces, he refused the offer, and would not give credit to the information.

At length the prince of Orange set sail with a fleet of five hundred ships and fourteen thousand men. He landed in England on the 15th of November, 1688, having sent before him a manifesto, in which he declared his intentions of saving the kingdom from destruction, vindicating the national liberty, and procuring the election of a free parliament. He was received with general satisfaction. The chief of the nobility and officers hastened to join him. James found himself abandoned by his people, by his ministers, his favourites, and even by his children. In a state of despair and distraction, he formed the dastardly resolution of escaping into France, and he sent off beforehand the queen and the infant prince. Following them himself, he was taken by the populace at Feversham and brought back to London. But the prince of Orange, to facilitate his escape, sent him under a slight guard to Rochester, from whence he soon found an opportunity of conveying himself to the continent.

The parliament was now summoned, but met simply as a *Convention*, not having the authority of the king's convocation. The commons declared, that James having attempted to overturn the constitution

of the kingdom by breaking the original contract between the king and people, and having, by the advice of Jesuits and other wicked persons, violated the fundamental laws and withdrawn himself out of the kingdom, had abdicated the government, and that the throne was thereby vacant. This vote, the terms of which, rather than the substance of it, occasioned some debate in the house of peers, was at last passed by a considerable majority.

The most important question remained: how was the government to be settled? A variety of different opinions ultimately resolved into two distinct proposals: either that a regent should be appointed, or the crown settled upon the king's eldest daughter Mary, the princess of Orange, and in case of her issue failing, upon the princess Anne. The stadtholder, while these matters were in agitation, conducted himself with infinite prudence and good policy. He entered into no intrigues with either of the houses of parliament, but during their whole deliberations preserved a total silence. At length, when it was resolved that the crown should be settled in the way of one of these alternatives, he assembled some of the chief nobility, and announced that, having been invited into the kingdom to restore its liberties, he had now happily effected that purpose; that it behooved not him to interfere in the determinations of the legislature with regard to the settlement of the crown; but that being informed as to the two alternatives which were proposed, he thought it his duty to declare that, in executing either of these plans, he could give no assistance; that he was determined to decline the office of a regent, and that he would rather remain a private person than enjoy a crown which must depend upon the life of another.

The sister princesses themselves seconded these views of the stadtholder; and the principal parties being thus agreed, a bill was proposed and passed by the convention, settling the crown on the prince and

princess of Orange—the former to have the sole administration of the government; the princess Anne to succeed after their death; her posterity after those of the princess of Orange, but before those of the prince by any other wife.

To this settlement of the crown the Convention added a declaration, fixing the nature of the constitution with respect to the rights of the subject and the royal prerogative. Of this declaration the following are the most essential articles. The king cannot suspend the laws nor the execution of them without the consent of parliament. He can neither erect an ecclesiastical nor any other tribunal by his own sole act. He cannot levy money without a parliamentary grant, nor beyond the terms for which it shall be granted. It is declared the right of the subjects to petition the crown, for which they can neither be imprisoned nor prosecuted. Protestant subjects may keep such arms for their defence as are allowed by law. No standing army can be kept up in time of peace but by consent of parliament. The elections of members of parliament must be free and uninfluenced, and there must be a freedom of parliamentary debate. Excessive bails, exorbitant fines, and too severe punishments are prohibited. The juries on trial for high treason must be members of the communities; and to remedy abuses, it is necessary that parliaments be frequently assembled. A new form was published instead of the old oath of supremacy, which declares that no prince, prelate, state, or foreign sovereign, hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, or superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, in the kingdom.

In Scotland, the revolution was not, as in England, effected by a coalition of the Whigs and Tories. There was an entire separation of these opposite parties. A Convention was summoned at Edinburgh, where the Tories, finding themselves greatly inferior in numbers, withdrew from the assembly, which then proceeded to pass a decisive vote that James, by mal-

administration and abuse of power, had forfeited all title to the crown; they therefore made a tender of the royal dignity to the prince and princess of Orange.

Such was the final settlement of the British government at the great era of the revolution of 1688.

CHAPTER XXXI.

On the Constitution of England:—Historical sketch of, up to the Revolution—The Legislative Power—Constitution of the House of Commons—House of Peers—The Executive Power—Powers of the Crown now limited—Habeas Corpus Act—Trial by Jury—Liberty of the Press.

It has been customary for our political writers, in order to give the greater weight to their theories of government, to trace the origin of the British constitution to a most remote period of antiquity. The opinion of Montesquieu is well known, who derives our constitution from the woods of Germany, and finds among those rude nations in their military assemblies the model of the British parliament; but if every assembly of a people is the model of a parliament, I see no reason why we may not derive it as well from the Spartans, the Athenians, or Romans, as from the Germans. It is sufficient measure of antiquity if we can trace our constitution even as far back as the Norman conquest.

The Anglo-Saxon Wittenagemot, as has been observed, contained, indeed, the rude model of a parliament; at least of a great council: for there are no grounds for believing that there was anything in that assembly approaching to a representation of the people.

William the Conqueror subverted the ancient fabric of the Saxon government; he dismissed the former

occupiers of lands to distribute them among his Normans; and he established at once a system best suited to maintain his own power—the feudal government till then unknown in Britain. In the continental nations of Europe, the feudal system arose by slow degrees. The authority of the crown was limited by the power of the barons, and the king had scarcely anything more than a nominal superiority over his nobles. It was very different in England: the feudal system was introduced at once, by a monarch whose power was absolute. He totally extinguished the ancient liberties of the people; he divided England into sixty thousand two hundred and fifteen military fiefs, all held of the crown, the possessors of which were obliged, under pain of forfeiture, to take up arms and repair to his standard on the first signal. The feudal system in France was only a number of parts, without any reciprocal adherence: in England it was a compound of parts, united by the strongest ties—where the regal authority, by its immense weight, consolidated the whole into one compact, indissoluble body; and from that remarkable difference we may account for the great difference of their constitutions. In France, the several provinces had no principle of union. The people found themselves oppressed by the great feudal lords, and often raised insurrections, and made frequent struggles for freedom; but these struggles, being partial, were of no consequence to the general liberty of the kingdom. In England, again, *all* found themselves oppressed by the enormous weight of the crown. It was a common grievance, and broke out at times into a violent struggle for the general liberty. It was the excessive power of the crown that in England produced at length the liberty of the people, because it gave rise to a spirit of union among the people in all their efforts to resist it.

The forest laws were a grievance felt by the whole nation; both by the barons and their vassals. William

the Conqueror reserved to himself the exclusive privilege of killing game throughout all England, and enacted the severest penalties against all who should ttempt it without his permission. The suppression, or rather mitigation of these penalties, was one of the articles of the *Charta de Forestâ*, which the barons and their vassals afterward obtained by force of arms. "*Nullus de cetero amittat vitam vel membra pro venatione nostrâ:*" (no one, moreover, shall lose life or limb for hunting.)—*Charta de Forestâ*, cap. 10. In these struggles they began to scrutinize into the foundations of authority, and to open their eyes to the natural rights of mankind.

Henry I. was forced to give way a little to this rising spirit, and to mitigate those laws which lay heaviest on the general liberty. Under Henry II. liberty took still a greater stretch, and the people obtained the privilege of trial by juries, one of the most valuable parts of the English constitution. John, imprudently, oppressed this spirit, and sought to check it in its infancy. We know the consequence—a general confederacy of all ranks and orders of men, which at length forced the sovereign into those valuable concessions, the *Charta de Forestâ* and *Magna Charta*, which, had they been scrupulously observed, the English would have been from that time a free people. The *Magna Charta*, however, observed or not observed, was always a code which certified the people of what were really their rights, and what they were entitled to vindicate.

The next memorable era in the growth of the English constitution was the reign of Henry III., when the deputies of the towns and boroughs were first admitted into parliament. It was always the chief object of his successor, Edward I., to ingratiate himself with his subjects: and requiring large subsidies for his great enterprises against Wales and Scotland, he took the new method of obtaining *from* the consent of the people, what his predecessors had endeavoured to ex-

act *by* their own power. This, therefore, is the era of the origin of the House of Commons. Edward confirmed the great charter no less than eleven times in the course of his reign—a certain proof to what lengths the people had attained in the assertion of their liberties; he likewise enacted one statute, which, next to the *Magna Charta*, may be considered as the great foundation of the rights of the people: "That no tax should be raised, or impost levied, without the consent of Lords and Commons."

Thus matters continued gradually advancing; and the scale of the people was daily acquiring an increase of weight, during the reigns of Edward II., Edward III., and Henry IV.; but the subsequent reigns were not so favourable. The wars against France, and the contests between the houses of York and Lancaster, so embroiled the nation, that the people had not leisure to think of grievances from the power of the crown, while their lives and fortunes were otherwise at stake; and when Henry VII. mounted the throne, the people, wearied out by calamities and longing for repose, abhorred even the idea of resistance. The nobility, almost exterminated, had no strength; and the people, who in their struggles with the crown had had nobles for their leaders, were now afraid to form any opposition. During the government of the house of Tudor the royal prerogative was gradually enlarging itself, and the people became accustomed to all compliances; comforting themselves with the thought that if the sovereign had the right of demanding, they had the right of granting, and consequently, if they chose, might still refuse. But the crown, even had they refused, had opened to itself collateral channels of supplies, and was, in fact, very soon independent of parliament in every article, unless in the framing of new laws. The authority of the Star Chamber and High Commission under the two last Henrys, and under Mary and Elizabeth, supplied, in most respects, to the sovereign the place of a parliament, and was

always at his command. The talents of Elizabeth, and the respectable figure then made by the nation in all public measures against foreign powers, blinded the people to such exertions of authority as would in these days appear the height of tyranny. The nation then seemed drowned in the most supine indifference to domestic liberty; and the people, like the subjects of any absolute monarchy, (which England, at that time, truly was in almost every sense,) had confined all their ideas to the power, dignity, and splendour of the crown.

But the succeeding prince awakened them from that inglorious lethargy. The former monarchs had marched in silence from one step to another, till they arrived at the height of despotism. James I. imprudently proclaimed his title and right to that authority —he was at no pains to disguise it; and the people, who had been for some time accustomed to be ruled like slaves, could not bear to be told that they were so. A spirit of opposition, which confined itself to complaints under this reign, began in the next to break out into active efforts. To abase the power of the crown was resolutely determined. The commons felt their weight, they knew what were their legal privileges, and they followed, at first, the most constitutional methods to vindicate them. Charles I. was ignorant of the dangers which surrounded him, and, led away by a very natural motive to maintain the power of his predecessors, he was imprudent enough to exert with rigour an authority which he wanted ultimate resources to support. At length, sensible of his own weakness, and perhaps at length conscious that the claims of the people were founded in justice, he signed the petition of rights, a grant more favourable to the liberties of the subject than the *Magna Charta*. The constitution, freed from all those despotic restraints, with which it had been fettered by the house of Tudor, was now fixed on a basis more favourable to the people's liberties than had ever been known in the annals

of the nation. Public discontent was now entirely removed—but selfish ambition remained unsatisfied. A few men who had all along made patriotism a cloak for their views of private interest, regretted the prospect of that harmonious coalition which promised now to take place between the king and people. Trifles were sufficient pretext for new discontent; the storm was blown up afresh, and continued with increasing violence till the regal authority was utterly extinguished.

New struggles, under the reign of Charles II., paved the way for new limitations. The Habeas Corpus Act was established, the great security of personal freedom. The constitution had begun again to take a form, when it was invaded by his successor, James, in so violent a manner, as to invite a foreign aid for its support. The consequence was the revolution, a new settlement of the succession to the crown, and a new and solemn contract between the king and people; the principal articles of which we have already seen:—the abolition of the power of taxation without the consent of parliament; the abolition of the crown's dispensing power; the abolition of a standing army in time of peace; the subject's right of petitioning the crown; the freedom of parliamentary debate; and to these we may add the liberty of the press, which was established a few years afterward.

The revolution, therefore, is the era of the final settlement of the English constitution. It was, before that, fluctuating and uncertain; at best, the people only guessed at the extent of their rights; they were now defined and positively ascertained.

Let us now consider that constitution under two distinct heads—the legislative and executive power, the last of which involves the prerogative of the crown.

The capital principle of the English constitution, on which all others depend, is, that the legislative power belongs to parliament alone; that is, the power of

making laws, of abrogating them, or of changing them. The constituent parts of parliament are, the king, lords, and commons. The house of commons is composed of the deputies of the different counties, the deputies of the principal towns, and of the two English universities. These, in all, amounted to five hundred and thirteen members; and to these were added, on the union with Scotland, forty-five representatives from that kingdom, and, since the union with Ireland, one hundred from that country.* The commons are elected by the freeholders, by authority of the king's writ, under the great seal, directed to the sheriffs of the counties. Every member of the house of commons, though elected by one particular district or borough, is understood to serve for the whole realm; for the purpose of his being elected is not for the benefit of any particular division of the country, but for the good of the whole. His office is to advise his sovereign (in terms of the writ of summons) *de communi consilio super negotiis quibusdam arduis et urgentibus, regem, statum et defensionem regni Angliæ, et ecclesiæ Anglicanæ concernentibus*:—"in common counsel, on all important and pressing business, relating to the king, the state and defence of the realm of England, and of the English Church." And therefore he is not bound to consult with, or take the advice of his constituents, upon any particular point, unless, as Sir William Blackstone rightly observes, he thinks it proper or prudent to do so.

The house of lords or peers is composed of the lords spiritual, who are the archbishops of Canterbury and York, with the twenty-four bishops of England and the lords temporal, or dukes, marquises, earls, viscounts, and barons of that kingdom. To these,

* The numbers of the house of commons, as it now stands under the Reform Act of 1831, are five hundred representatives for England and Wales, fifty-three for Scotland, and one hundred and five for Ireland—total six hundred and fifty-eight.—EDITOR.

since the unions, are added sixteen peers, delegated by the body of the Scottish nobility, and twenty-eight temporal and four spiritual lords, to represent the peerage and prelacy of Ireland. The lord chancellor is the president of the house of peers; the speaker is the president of the house of commons. The king is the third component part of parliament. It is he alone who can convoke it, and he only can dissolve or prorogue it. The moment the parliament is dissolved, it ceases to exist: a prorogation only suspends its power during a limited time.

The limited duration of parliament secures its purity and its independence; and the renewal and change of members in that branch which is nominated by the people, prevents those dangers that might arise from the hereditary constitution of the other branches. Strict laws are in force to prevent disorders at elections; and it is wisely provided that even the death of the sovereign shall afford no room for commotions or occasion embarrassment in the public business; for in the eye of law the throne is never vacant; but from the moment of the king's death, is supposed to be filled by his heir. Further, on the death of any king or queen, "the parliament in being shall continue for six months, unless sooner prorogued or dissolved by the successor. If the parliament be at the time of the king's death separated by adjournment or prorogation, it shall notwithstanding assemble immediately; and if no parliament is then in being, the members of the last parliament shall assemble and be again a parliament." *Blackstone*, b. i. ch. 2. "In like manner, the privy council shall continue for six months after the demise of the crown, unless sooner determined by the successor." *Ibid.* b. i. ch. 5. The judges, by an act of parliament passed in the reign of George III., hold their offices for life; and all the great officers of state, and in general all officers civil or military throughout the whole British empire, continue in

office for six months after the king's demise, unless removed by the successor.

Each of the houses of parliament has a negative on any proposition made by the other, and the king has a negative on both.

All measures respecting government, all questions regarding public affairs, all propositions for the public good, may take their rise indifferently in either house, and become the subject of deliberation; with this exception, that all bills for granting money must have their beginning in the house of commons, and can admit of no change or alteration in the house of lords, who must either simply receive or simply reject them.* All other questions or propositions which are passed in the affirmative in either of the houses, are next transmitted for the consideration of the other, where, if rejected, the measure is at an end; if passed, nothing else is required but the royal assent. If that is refused, the bill remains without force or effect; if granted, it is an established law, which cannot be repealed but

* The reason usually given generally for this jealousy of the commons with respect to money bills, is, that the supplies are raised on the body of the people, and therefore it is proper that they alone should have the right of taxing themselves: a reason which would be good, only in the case that the commons taxed none but themselves. The true reason, according to Sir W. Blackstone, arises from the spirit of the constitution. The lords being a permanent hereditary body, created at pleasure by the king, are supposed more liable to be influenced by the crown, and when once influenced, to continue so, than the commons, who are a temporary elective body, freely nominated by the people. It would, therefore, be extremely dangerous to give the lords any power of framing new taxes for the subject: it is sufficient that they have a power of rejecting, if they think the commons too lavish or improvident in their grants. Under the description of money bills are included all grants by which any money is to be raised for any purpose, or by any mode whatever, from the subject; either for the exigencies of government, and collected from the kingdom in general, as the land-tax; or for private benefit, and collected in any particular district, as by turnpikes, parish rates, and the like.—*Blackstone*, b. i. ch. 2.

by the united will of all the three constituent parts of parliament.*

The executive power of the government is lodged in the crown. The king is charged with the execution of the laws, and supplied with necessary powers for that purpose. In the exercise of this duty, however, the king is no more than the first magistrate, and his conduct must be regulated by the laws of the realm equally with that of his subjects.

In that capacity, the first branch of his office is the administration of justice. He is chief of all courts of judicature, of which the judges are only his substitutes. He, by his law-officers, is the prosecutor in all high crimes and offences; and he has the power of pardoning or remitting the execution of all sentences

In the second place, the king is the fountain of all honour; and the distributor of titles and dignities, as well as the disposer of the offices of state.

In the third place, he is the superintendent of commerce; he has the prerogative of regulating weights and measures, and the sole power of coining money.

In the fourth place, he is the head of the church; he names the archbishops and bishops, and can alone convoke the assembly of the clergy, and dissolve and prorogue them.

In the fifth place, he is commander-in-chief of all the sea and land forces; he alone can levy troops, equip fleets, and name all officers by sea and land.

In the sixth place, he has the power of declaring

*It is to be remarked, however, that it is an established part of the constitution of parliament, "That whatever matter arises concerning either house of parliament, ought to be examined, discussed, and adjudged in that house to which it relates, and not elsewhere." Hence, for instance, the lords will not suffer the commons to interfere in settling the election of a peer of Scotland; the commons will not allow the lords to judge of the election of a burgess; nor will either house permit the subordinate courts of law to examine the merits of either case.—*Blackstone*, b. i. ch. 2.

war and making peace, of contracting alliances, and sending and receiving ambassadors.

And lastly, the king is above the reach of all courts of law, and is not personally responsible to any judicature for his conduct in the administration of government.

From this enumeration of the powers of the sovereign, at first sight, a stranger might almos conclude that the king of England was an absolute monarch. He has not only a negative on all the proceedings of the legislative assemblies, but can summon or dismiss them at his will, and the whole executive power of the state centres in him alone. But let us now seriously attend to the manner in which these powers and prerogatives of the crown are limited.

The king is entirely dependant on parliament for all subsidies; the revenues of the crown are a mere trifle. The king can levy armies and equip fleets, but without the aid of parliament he cannot maintain them. He bestows offices, but without parliament he cannot pay salaries. He declares war, but without parliament he cannot carry it on. De Lolme has well compared the powers of the king of England to a ship completely equipped, but from which the parliament can at pleasure drain off the water and leave it aground.

Such is the weight in the scale of parliament against the powers of the crown; a weight so entirely preponderating, that parliament itself has moderated the exercise of its prerogatives, by an established usage of granting at the commencement of every reign a settled revenue upon the prince for life, a provision sufficient to support the dignity of the crown without putting it in his power greatly to abridge the liberties of the people; and a provision which being at an end with the life of the sovereign, and requiring a new grant for every successor, puts it in the power of parliament to remedy all abuses and encroachments at the beginning of every reign, and thus bring the con-

stitution back to its first principles. In short, there is in the British constitution a power of periodical reformation, which is an effectual check to its ever being corrupted by encroachments from the crown. The sovereigns of Britain do not now succeed to the powers and prerogatives of their predecessor. The constitution is, or may be, fixed at the beginning of every reign: because, unless the name of king, the sovereign has neither power nor dignity, till the parliament vote his revenue and subsidies; which they can withhold till every abuse is remedied, and all former encroachments retrenched and put a stop to.

But still further is the power of the sovereign subject to continual limitation. The king can never reign without a parliament. By an act of Charles II. he must assemble a parliament at least once in three years, and, in order that the election of members may be made with due deliberation, the writs must be issued forty days before the meeting of parliament.

The king is the head of the church; but he cannot alter the established religion, nor call individuals to account for their religious opinions; and ecclesiastical regulations must be made by the assembly of the clergy.

The king is the first magistrate; but he cannot interfere with the courts of judicature in the administration of justice: he can assist at no trials, civil or criminal, and any person may demand the king's name and authority to prosecute crimes.

He has the privilege of coining money, but he cannot alter the standard either in weight or alloy.

He has the power of pardoning offences, but he cannot exempt the offenders from making a compensation to the parties injured, if it is demanded.

The king has the military power. The sea forces he can raise, disband, and regulate at pleasure, because they cannot be turned against the liberties of the people; but the land forces he cannot raise without the consent of parliament. A standing body of troops is,

indeed, established by parliament; but the funds for their payment are never granted for more than a year. The Mutiny Act, by which alone they are regulated, must be renewed from year to year.

The king, in the last place, is above the reach of all courts of law; but his *ministers*, his indispensable instruments, are answerable for all the measures of government. All misapplications of the public money, all ruinous and improper expeditions, all abuses of power are chargeable to *their* account; and the commons, the guardians of the constitution, have a right to impeach them at the bar of the house of lords. A minister impeached for misconduct cannot plead in excuse the commands of the sovereign; nor will it avail him, pleading guilty to the charge, to produce the royal pardon. He must suffer as the author of those measures of which he was the instrument—a noble and most effectual antidote against the evils of misgovernment!

The laws, which thus effectually limit the power of the crown, secure likewise the freedom of parliament. The freedom of debate cannot be questioned, or any member called to account on that score, in any court or place out of parliament.

To these observations, I shall add a few remarks on three striking peculiarities of the English constitution in favour of the liberties of the subject; the *Habeas Corpus Act*, *Trial by Jury*, and the *Liberty of the Press*

The methods which the laws of England formerly established to remedy unjust imprisonment, were what are termed writs of *main-prize*, *de odio et atia*, and *de homine replegiando*, which were orders to the sheriffs of the counties to inquire into the causes of the prisoner's confinement, and, according to the circumstances of his case, either simply to discharge him, or admit him to bail. But these methods are now tacitly abolished by the Habeas Corpus, which is a writ issuing from the Court of King's Bench, whose effects ex-

tend over all England, by which the king requires the person who holds any of his subjects in custody, immediately to carry him before the judge, to certify the date of his confinement and the cause of it, and to abide the judge's decree, whether he shall detain him or set him at liberty. Of this beneficial statute, there were frequent evasions which from time to time called forth various amendments. The last and most effectual of all was by the act of Habeas, which, as we have observed, passed in the thirtieth year of Charles II., and which has cut off every source of oppression, and every handle of evasion.

The principal articles of this act are, in the first place, to fix the different terms for bringing a prisoner, in proportion to the distance of the place of his confinement: the longest term is twenty days. In the second place, the officer or keeper must, within six hours, deliver to the prisoner on his demand, a copy of the warrant of his commitment, under the penalty of one hundred pounds, and being disabled to hold his office. In the third place, no person once delivered by a writ of Habeas Corpus shall be recommitted for the same offence, under the penalty of five hundred pounds sterling. Fourthly, every person committed for treason or felony shall, if he require it, in the first week of the next term, or the first day of the next session, be indicted in that term or session, or else admitted to bail. If acquitted, or not indicted, he shall be discharged. Fifthly, any of the twelve judges, or the lord chancellor, refusing a writ of Habeas, shall forfeit five hundred pounds. In the last place, no subject of England shall be sent prisoner to Scotland, Ireland, Jersey, Guernsey, or any place beyond the seas, under penalty to the party committing, and to all who assist or advise, of forfeiting five hundred pounds, to be recovered with treble costs, being disabled from holding any office, being imprisoned for life, forfeiting his whole estate for life, and being incapable of the king's pardon. Such is the nature of the

Habeas Corpus, a most invaluable security for the personal liberty of the subject.

It must be observed, that the Habeas Corpus, being an English law, and prior to the treaty of union, does not extend to Scotland. The liberty of the subject, however, is almost as effectually guarded in that country as in England; though there the term of imprisonment before trial may, indeed, be of longer duration. By the Scottish statute 1701, cap. 6, no person can be imprisoned in order to trial for any crime without a warrant in writing expressing the cause, and proceeding on a signed information, unless in the case of indignities done to judges, riots, and some other offences mentioned in the statute. Every prisoner committed to jail for crimes not capital is entitled to a release on finding bail, according to his circumstances; and for the relief of those who are unable to find bail, any prisoner may apply to the criminal judge, requiring that his trial may be brought on without unnecessary delays. The judge, within twenty-four hours of such application, must issue letters directed to messengers for intimating to the prosecutor that he may fix a diet for the prisoner's trial within sixty days after the intimation, under the pains of wrongous imprisonment. Still further, and that there may be no unnecessary or oppressive protraction of a trial after it is once begun, the prisoner is entitled to insist for his liberty, if his trial is not concluded within forty days, if before the supreme criminal court, and within thirty if before any other. This privilege is competent to be pleaded in all cases, except in the crime of forgery. Thus the natives of Scotland seem to be nearly on a par with those of England, in that most inestimable of all blessings, personal liberty.

The only exception to the general liberty of the subject under the British government, is the power of impressing seamen by the king's commission for the supply of the navy. This power has at all times been reluctantly submitted to, and much complained against

as an infringement of the rights of the subject. But *salus populi est suprema lex*, (the safety of the people is the highest law.) If it is absolutely necessary for the preservation of the state, on occasion of sudden danger from an enemy, that the navy should be instantly and effectually armed, that circumstance at once demonstrates the legality of the practice. Moreover, as the subjection to this hazard is known by all who engage in the profession of a seaman, their entry into the profession is a tacit consent to whatever is necessarily attendant upon it. It has been very clearly shown by Sir Michael Foster, that this practice, and the granting of powers to the Admiralty for that purpose is of very ancient date, and has been uniformly continued to the present time, so as now to be understood as a part of the common law of the land.

Another of the highest privileges of a British subject is the trial of all crimes by jury. The preliminaries to trial are different in England and in Scotland. The number of jurors are different; twelve in England, and fifteen in Scotland. Unanimity of opinion is required in the former; a majority of voices is decisive in the latter. In both modes of trial, it is the privilege of the criminal to be judged by the impartial verdict of his peers. The prisoner has even a share in the choice of his jury, for the law has allowed him the right of challenging or objecting to such as he may think exceptionable. In England, the prisoner may challenge peremptorily, that is, without showing any cause, twenty jurors successively. The witnesses upon the trial deliver their evidence in presence of the prisoner, who is allowed to question them, and to produce witnesses in his own behalf. In cases of treason, the accused person may challenge successively thirty-five jurors; he may have two counsel to assist him on his trial; and no treason, unless actual attempt upon the life of the king, can be prosecuted after three years from the offence. The opinions of the judges in summing up the evidence have no weight but such as

the jury choose to give to them, and their verdict ought to proceed entirely on their own belief and conviction. Lord Chief Justice Hale has, in his History of the Common Law of England, summed up, in a very few words, the duty and powers of a jury. "The jury, in their recess, are to consider their evidence; to weigh the credibility of the witnesses, and force and efficacy of their testimonies: they are not bound to the rules of the civil law, to have two witnesses to prove every fact, unless it be in cases of treason; nor to reject one witness because he is single, or always to believe two witnesses, if the probability of the fact does upon other circumstances reasonably encounter them. It may fall out that a jury, upon their own knowledge, may know a thing to be false which a witness has sworn to be true; or may know a witness to be incompetent or incredible though nothing be objected against him, and may give their verdict accordingly."

The effect of the verdict of a jury is final and positive. If the prisoner is acquitted, he is instantly set at liberty, and cannot on any pretence be tried again for the same crime. If found guilty, the judge must pronounce sentence according to the law. But this law must contain a positive enactment with regard to the special crime which was brought before the jury; for, in crimes, no constructive extension of laws can be admitted. The spirit of our laws considers the impunity of an offender as a very small matter in comparison with the dangers that would result from such extension.

The last particular I shall take notice of, and what is in fact the guardian of the British constitution, is the *liberty of the press.*

To supply the unavoidably deficiency of all legislative provisions; to prevent the silent deviations of magistrates from their duty (transgressions the more dangerous that no punishment can reach them); and to be a constant check upon the minutest departments

of the constitution, as a pendulum regulates the equable motion of all the wheels of a clock—there is one power in the British government whose exertions are constant and unremitting, a just regulator of the whole parts of that nice and complicated machine. This is the power which every individual has of expressing his opinion of the whole conduct of government, without reserve, by word or writing—a power which is so regulated, however, as to insure all the benefit of the ancient censorship without its mischiefs. The censorial tribunal at Rome was entirely arbitrary, which repressed all freedom of judgment in the public; or at least, rendered it of no consequence, since the regulation of government was supremely lodged in the breasts of a few men, with whom that judgment could have no effect. But a British subject has the right of free judgment on all public measures, of remonstrating to his governors, of carrying his complaint and his appeal to the public by means of the press, of submitting to the general opinion the views and principles of these governors expressed in parliament; and thus, by openly examining and scrutinizing their whole conduct, to furnish the most powerful restraint against every species of malversation. In the British government, there is no person so high in administration, as not to feel the weight of public opinion. The loss of popular favour to a statesman will furnish such opposition to his measures as to gall and embitter every hour of his life. Even the taunts, the curses, or the hissings of the vulgar, there is no man whatever that can long support with any degree of tranquillity; and when he considers, that not only his present fame is at stake, but, by means of the press, his memory, to the latest posterity, he will soon find that he is irresistibly and most powerfully restrained within the bounds of his duty.

The notoriety of the whole proceedings of government by means of the press, and the perfect knowledge which is diffused through the nation of all that is

said and done in parliament, is attended moreover, with the beneficial effect of purifying from time to time, the legislative assembly. As the votes and political sentiments of the members are always known, and every county or borough has its eye on the conduct of its representatives, the House of Commons may undergo a gradual purgation from successive vacancies, or be purified at once at the commencement of every new parliament.

Yet this inestimable privilege of British subjects, without certain limitations, would, instead of good, be productive of the greatest mischiefs. Were any man at liberty to wound the vitals of the government under which he lives, by an open attack upon the fundamental doctrines of civil subordination, and the respect due to the established laws of the land; were he at liberty to loosen the bonds of civil society, by combating the first principles of all religion; or were he suffered with impunity to injure the reputation, life, or property of his neighbour, by false and malicious accusations, there would be *no government;* and liberty itself would perish, because it would have no safeguard or protection. The liberty of the press in Britain consists, then, in *this*, that there is no examination or censure of writings *before* they are published; the press is open to everything; but *after* publication, such writings as offend in the particulars I have mentioned, are subject to the penalties of the law, awarded on the verdict of a jury. The impartial public are thus ultimately the judges of the tendency of all writings addressed to themselves; and it is equally wise and consistent with the spirit of that liberty that all authors should stand or fall by their determination.

CHAPTER XXXII.

HISTORY OF FRANCE UNDER LOUIS XIII., AND OF SPAIN AND PORTUGAL UNDER PHILIP III. and IV.—Mary de Medicis Regent—Siege of Rochelle—Cardinal Richelieu—Death of Louis XIII.—Spain—Philip III.—Philip IV.—Degraded state of Spain—Portugal throws off the Spanish yoke—Constitution of Portugal—Constitution of Spain.

THE wise, equitable and vigorous administration of Henry IV. had raised the kingdom of France from the lowest pitch of misery and anarchy to peace, dignity, and prosperity. Upon his death, all those advantages were lost at once. Mary de Medicis, his widow, a woman of a weak mind, but of ungovernable passions, and of a domineering, insolent character, had been appointed Regent in the minority of her son Louis XIII. Her restless and ambitious spirit embroiled both the court and the nation in factions; and in endeavouring to secure to her interest the nobility, whom it was not possible ever firmly to unite among themselves, she squandered away the public money. The kingdom lost all its weight abroad, and relapsed into the same disorders at home, which we have seen in the times of Francis II., of Charles IX., and of Henry III. Mary of Medicis disgusted the French, in the first place, by her partiality to her countrymen, the Italians. Concini, a Florentine, a high favourite of the queen-regent, was advanced to the dignity of a marshal of France; a sufficient reason for rendering the queen and her minister odious to the nobility and to the kingdom. The Maréchal d'Ancre, for such was the title he assumed, trusted too much to the favour of his mistress, and to that appearance of power which was its consequence. The nobility combined against him, and he was assassinated in a most inhuman manner in the palace of the Louvre. The populace, in that spirit of savage cruelty, which in all scenes of disorder seems to be characteristic of that

nation, are said actually to have torn his heart from the carcass and devoured it. The vengeance of the nobility did not stop with the death of the minister. The queen herself was a sufferer as well as her favourite. Her guards were removed, she was hurried from Paris, and confined in the castle of Blois, where she was kept a prisoner for two years, till she was released by the duke of Epernon, to whom she had originally been indebted for her appointment to the regency of the kingdom.

In this conjuncture everything was involved in anarchy and confusion. The queen-mother was actually at war with her own son, the whole nation divided into parties, and the government of France in the lowest state of weakness and inefficiency.

The genius of the great Richelieu, then a young man, effected a reconciliation for a time between the contending factions, and he obtained, as a reward for this piece of service, the dignity of a cardinal, at the queen's solicitation. But this calm was of short continuance. The factious nobility began to excite new disturbances, which Louis XIII., who was now of age, had neither the discretion nor the ability to compose. These commotions were increased by religious differences, for the protestants, who had enjoyed an unmolested tranquillity under Henry IV., and for a while under the minority of Louis, were now exposed to fresh persecutions. They were obliged to take up arms; and a political and religious war raged with equal violence at the same time. The king, amid these commotions, was obliged alternately to bribe his own servants, and to negotiate with his rebel nobility.

While public affairs were in this situation, Mary of Medicis had the address to bring the new favourite Richelieu into the council, against the inclination of the king and his favourite counsellors; and in a very short time this great politician completely gained the confidence of his royal master, and signally displayed his splendid abilities in quieting all disorders, and

raising the French monarchy to a very high pitch of splendour.

The cardinal de Richelieu entered on his administration with that vigorous activity which marks a bold and daring spirit. A fleet was necessary for the reduction of Rochelle, where the Calvinists, who then suffered great persecution, were attempting to imitate the examples of the Hollanders, and throw off their subjection to the crown of France. The cardinal found it impossible to fit out an armament with that celerity which was necessary, and he concluded a bargain with the Dutch to furnish a fleet for subduing their Protestant brethren. An opportunity thus offered of making money—the Dutch had no scruple on the score of conscience; and they fought for the Catholic religion as keenly as they had done half a century before for the Protestant.

It was necessary, however, that the nation should be able to carry on its wars without having recourse to the aid of foreigners, and Richelieu gave peace to the Protestants, that he might be in a capacity of attending to the most material interests of the kingdom, its strength and internal prosperity.

At this time three ministers, equally powerful, regulated the general policy of all Europe; Olivarez in Spain Buckingham in England, and Richelieu in France. Of these, Buckingham was reckoned the worst politician, as he studied more his own private passions than the grandeur of his country, which is the true source of ambition in a politic minister. An intrigue of Buckingham's with Louis's queen, Anne of Austria, which gave high umbrage to the court of France, is supposed to have been the real cause of a war with England. That minister prevailed on his sovereign to light up the contention between the Protestants and Catholics in France, by sending a force to the aid of the Calvinists of Rochelle. But the design was not so speedily executed as to escape the vigilance of Cardinal Richelieu, who, at the head of a considerable body of men,

obliged Buckingham, with the loss of half his armament, to return to England.

The Rochellers, however, held out the town with the most obstinate resolution, against the troops of the cardinal, who was obliged to employ every resource of policy, as well as of war, for their reduction. In this siege, which lasted for the course of a whole year, the cardinal commanded in person. It was found impossible to take the town while it continued open to the English fleet. An immense mole was therefore constructed in the sea to prevent the approach of the English shipping. The expedient succeeded, and Rochelle at length was obliged to surrender. It was stripped of its privileges, and the Catholic religion established in place of the Protestant; though the Calvinists were allowed the private exercise of their worship. The rest of the Protestant towns of France were treated in the same manner as Rochelle; their fortifications were thrown down, and they were deprived of every privilege that might be dangerous to the state. Thus the Protestant party in France, a very numerous body of men, were disarmed and crushed for ever. Neither the Swiss nor the Dutch were so powerful as the French Protestants, at the time that these nations erected themselves into independent sovereignties. Geneva, though a very inconsiderable state, asserted its liberty and maintained it. Yet the Calvinists of France were quite overpowered, and the reason was, that they were scattered through the whole provinces: it was impossible to unite them; and they were attacked by superior numbers, and by disciplined troops.

Louis XIII., though a monarch of a weak frame of mind, had somewhat of a military disposition. He entered into the schemes of Richelieu for the aggrandizement of France, and fought at the head of his armies, both in his own kingdom and in Italy. Richelieu was a man whose genius was truly astonishing. He was negotiating at one time *with all*

and *against most* of the sovereigns of Europe. His principal aim was to humble the house of Austria; he wanted to establish a duke of Mantua independent of the king of Spain; he proposed to harass the Austrian dominions in Flanders, and had prevailed with Gustavus Adolphus, the king of Sweden, to make a descent upon Germany. But while these great schemes were in agitation, a formidable cabal at court was secretly undermining his power. Gaston, duke of Orleans, the king's brother, detested the cardinal de Richelieu; Mary of Medicis was jealous of that very power which she had contributed to raise; and most of the nobility were his secret enemies. This illustrious man, whose intrepidity was equal to all situations, suppressed these cabals in a manner which astonished all Europe. The maréchal de Marillac, one of the nobles who was most obnoxious to him, was arrested at the head of an army, and condemned and executed for treason. The duke of Orleans, the king's brother, apprehensive of a similar fate, quitted the kingdom; and the queen-mother, Mary of Medicis, removed from all concern in the government, ended her career of ambition in voluntary exile at Brussels.

The duke of Orleans, however, flattered himself with the idea of being the avenger of the royal family. He was supported by the duke de Montmorenci, who raised at his own expense an army of several thousand men. The king's army, or rather that of the cardinal, came to an engagement with him, which terminated all the hopes of Orleans and his adherents. Montmorenci was taken prisoner, condemned and executed for treason, and the duke, after making all submissions, thought himself extremely happy to be allowed to quit the kingdom, and retire to Brussels, to keep his mother company. The most surprising circumstance in the whole of these transactions is, that Cardinal Richelieu found himself able to make such exertions of the most despotic power while *the nation* were his enemies. He surmounted all opposition;

and while the genius of most men, even of great abilities, would have found it sufficient occupation to wage war against those cabals and factions which were continually meditating his downfall, this extraordinary man not only completely foiled the schemes of his enemies, but found means to raise the kingdom of France to a most flourishing condition at home, while he extended her glory and influence over all Europe. While he was making open war against the house of Austria in Germany, Italy, and Spain, he was at this very time employing his thoughts in the establishment of the *French Academy*. He held meetings in his palace of the most celebrated literary geniuses of the age; he cultivated the *belles lettres* with success, and composed himself some dramatic pieces, which were exhibited on the French theatre.

The war against Austria, however, did not succeed to his wishes, till the duke of Weimar gained at length a complete victory, in which he took prisoners four of the imperial generals; and till the Spanish branch of the house of Austria was stripped of Portugal by the revolution in that kingdom, and dispossessed likewise of Catalonia by an open rebellion in the year 1640.

Louis XIII., who, though a prince of a gloomy disposition, had his favourites among the court ladies, was weak enough sometimes to listen to those reports which they were fond of circulating to the prejudice of the cardinal de Richelieu. The queen herself, Anne of Austria, had been so imprudent as to signify her aversion to him. Richelieu laid his hands upon her father confessor; ordered the queen's papers to be seized, on the pretence of a correspondence with the enemies of the state; and Anne of Austria had very nearly undergone the same fate with Mary of Medicis. The king himself had sometimes hastily expressed his indignation at the violent conduct of his minister. A favourite of the king, the young marquis de Cinque Mars, encouraged by these expressions, which he took

for a certain presage of the downfall of Richelieu, entered into a conspiracy with Gaston, duke of Orleans, and the duke de Bouillon, against the cardinal's life. The plot was discovered; Cinque Mars was put to death, the duke de Bouillon had his estate confiscated, and Gaston, after making an humble submission, consented to remain a prisoner at the castle of Blois. The detection of this conspiracy was the last scene of the life of Cardinal Richelieu, as well as that of Louis XIII., who survived him but a few months.

The administration of Cardinal Richelieu, though stained with factions, with civil war, and with daily executions, was, on the whole, extremely glorious for the kingdom.

France, in his time, was opulent at home; her finances were in good order; and she was most respectable abroad. There appeared at this time likewise the dawn of that good taste which arrived at such distinguished splendour in the succeeding age of Lewis XIV.

SPAIN.

From the period of the death of Philip II., the Spanish monarchy visibly declined in its influence abroad—though, at the same time, the authority of its sovereigns, or the power of the prince over the subject, was daily increasing. The government, absolute as it was, was ill administered. There was no regulation or system of supplies for the exigencies of the state. So great was the neglect and the disorder of the revenues during the reign of Philip III., that in the war which still continued with the United Provinces, he had not money to pay his troops. His naval forces were inferior to those of Holland and Zealand, and they stripped him of the Molucca islands and of Amboyna in the East Indies, while, at the same time, his armies in the Netherlands could make no impression on the power of this infant republic. He was obliged, in fine, to conclude a truce with Holland for

twelve years, to leave the Dutch in possession of all they had acquired, to promise them a free trade to the East Indies, and to restore to the house of Nassau its estates situated within the dominions of the Spanish monarchy.

It is impossible to fathom the reasons of a policy so very destructive as that which was embraced by Philip III. in this juncture of national weakness. The Moors, who had still subsisted in Spain from the period of the conquest of Grenada, and were a peaceable, a useful, and a most industrious race of subjects, were computed to amount at this time to six or seven hundred thousand. Some trifling insurrections, occasioned by the persecutions of the Inquisition, attracted the notice of the sovereign, who, with the most indiscreet, impolitic, and destructive zeal, decreed, that all the Moors should be expelled from the kingdom of Spain. Two years were spent by Philip in transporting the most industrious part of his subjects out of the kingdom, and in depopulating his dominions. A few of these wretched exiles betook themselves to France; the rest, and the greatest part, returned to Africa, their ancient country. Spain became an immense body without vigour or motion. The court of Philip III. was a chaos of intrigues, like that of Louis XIII. The monarch was governed by the duke of Lerma; but the confusion in which everything was involved, at length drove *him* from his station of a minister. The disorders increased under Philip IV., who was ruled by Olivarez, as his father had been by Lerma. It is a curious fact, that the best information we have of the court intrigues during these reigns, and of the character of the prime ministers, Lerma and Olivarez, is to be found in a book of romance, the *Adventures of Gil Blas*, written by M. le Sage, who, in treating occasionally of state affairs, has interspersed a great deal of genuine history. We may observe, at the same time, that the account which the same author has given of the state of literature in Spain is

extremely just, and that his picture of the manners of the people is in general very faithful.

Spain, during the reign of Philip IV., was as impotent abroad as she was miserable at home. Every species of commerce was repressed by the most exorbitant taxes. The Flemish manufactures supplied the whole kingdom, for the Spaniards had neither arts of their own, nor industry. In short, notwithstanding her immense territories, and those prodigious sources of wealth which she possessed in America, Spain was so exhausted, that the ministry under Philip IV. found themselves reduced to the necessity of coining money of copper, to which they gave the value of silver. This reign was one continued series of losses and defeats. The Dutch, at the expiration of the truce, made themselves masters of Brazil. The province of Artois was invaded by the French, and Catalonia, jealous of her privileges, which the crown had encroached upon, revolted and threw herself into the arms of France.

The revolt of Catalonia was the signal for another of much more importance. Portugal, at this very period, shook off the yoke of Spain, and recovered her former independence as a kingdom. No revolution was ever effected with more speed or with more facility. The imprudent and impolitic administration of Olivarez had alienated the minds of the Portuguese from all allegiance to the Spanish crown.

John, duke of Braganza, who was descended from the ancient race of the Portuguese monarchs, had at this time the command of the army. Instigated by the ambition of his dutchess, a woman of great spirit, and seeing the disposition of the nation completely favourable to his views, he caused himself to be proclaimed king in the city of Lisbon; and this example of the capital was immediately followed all over the kingdom, and in all the Portuguese settlements abroad. Portugal, from that era, became an independent sovereignty, after having been for sixty years an appanage or dependancy of the kingdom of Spain.

The government of Portugal approaches to an absolute monarchy. Nominally indeed, in most important articles which regard the liberty of the subject, the consent of the states is necessary; these, however are but rarely convoked. The ordinary business of the government is conducted entirely by the king and his counsel of state, which is appointed by himself. The revenue of the crown arises from its domains, the duties on exports and imports, the taxes, and formerly, from a stated proportion of the gold imported from the Brazils. Commerce and manufactures are in a very low state in Portugal; their trade being conducted with no enlarged views or liberal policy, is of little solid advantage to the country; and with a soil and climate equal to any in Europe, the agriculture of the kingdom is greatly neglected.

This period, between the reign of Philip II. and the end of the reign of Philip IV., though it was the diminution of the Spanish greatness in point of power, was the era of its highest lustre in point of literary genius. The entertainments of the stage were far superior to those of any other European nation; and the Spaniards likewise carried poetical composition, romance and even history, to a considerable degree of perfection. The mechanic and the useful arts were however in a very rude state. The Spaniards, during these reigns, had very few of the refined pleasures of life, but in return they were free from those miseries which fell to the lot of their neighbors. While France and England exhibited a painful scene of faction, civil war and bloodshed, the Spaniards passed their days in indolent and tranquil insignificance.

It is somewhat curious to remark, that at the time when, in all the rest of the European nations, the scale of the people was acquiring weight against the power of the sovereign, the reverse was the case in Spain. The kingdom, from being once elective, had for some ages become hereditary; but it was not till

the reign of Charles V. that the king of Spain became an absolute prince.

There is no question that Spain was once an elective kingdom. In treating formerly of the manners of the Gothic nations, we took notice, that during the reign of the *Visigoth* princes in Spain, these sovereigns were always chosen by the *proceres* or nobles: although at the same time this assembly of the *proceres* generally paid the greatest regard to the family of the last prince, or to the person whom he, upon his death-bed, had designed as his successor. This, it must be allowed, is a very near approach to hereditary succession, and through length of time commonly changes into that constitution. Accordingly, for many centuries past, there appears not the least trace of an elective monarchy in Spain; the crown devolving always of course, without any form or ceremony, on the nearest in blood to the last prince. The kings of Spain have sometimes limited the succession to certain families, ranks, and persons; of which the first instance was that of Philip III., in the year 1619, and the second, of Philip V., in 1713.

The power of the king was formerly limited by the cortes, or parliament of the kingdom. These, which formerly, especially in Castile, had great prerogatives, and were a powerful restraint upon the authority of the sovereign, were in a manner annihilated by Charles V., who deprived the nobles and the prelates of their seat in those assemblies; allowing only a convention of the deputies or agents of the towns, who have very little power, and are absolutely at the devotion of the sovereign.

The king of Spain now governs with the advice of his cabinet council, the *Consejo Real*, who are the secretary of state, and three or four of the principal nobility, with whom he chooses to consult upon the affairs of government. There is no body or department in the constitution which is entitled to restrain

or regulate the will of the sovereign, who is therefore an absolue prince.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

GERMANY FROM THE ABDICATION OF CHARLES V. TO THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA—Ferdinand I.—Thirty years' War—Ferdinand II.—Palatinate laid waste—Gustavus Adolphus—Ferdinand III.—Peace of Westphalia.

AT the time when France was in a very flourishing situation under Henry IV., England, under Elizabeth, and Spain extremely formidable under Philip II., the empire of Germany made by no means so respectable a figure. Since the abdication of Charles V. till the reign of Leopold, it had no influence whatever in Italy. The contrary pretensions of the emperors to nominate the popes, and those of the pontiffs to confer the imperial dignity, were insensibly fallen into oblivion. Germany was a republic of princes over whom the emperor presided, and these princes, having constant interferences of interest, generally maintained a civil war, which was fomented by the three contending sects of religion, the Catholics, Lutherans and Calvinists. Yet the political fabric of the empire amid all its disturbances, remained unshaken.

Ferdinand I. endeavoured to unite the three religious sects, and to effect a harmony between the princes of the empire; but the attempt was vain. Maximilian II. was less absolute than Ferdinand, and could still less bring about such a coalition and his successor Rodolph II. was yet inferior to him in the necessary talents of a sovereign. He was fonder of philosophical researches than of the cares of the empire, and spent that time with Tycho Brahé, the astronomer, which would have been more profitably employed in opposing the measures of Henry IV., a prince, who,

had he reigned but a few years longer, would, in all probability have annihilated, or at least very greatly abridged, the power of the house of Austria. The religious dissensions continued daily to increase in virulence and animosity, and at length the catholic and protestant leagues plunged Germany into *a civil war of thirty years' continuance*, and reduced that empire to the greatest extremity of national distress. Upon the death of Matthias, the successor of Rodolph, Ferdinand, archduke of Gratz, was elected emperor. He was a zealous catholic, and the protestants of Bohemia, who had suffered under the government of Matthias, were apprehensive of still greater restraint under Ferdinand. They determined, therefore, to be governed by a prince of their own persuasion; and they accordingly conferred the crown of Bohemia on the elector palatine, who had married the daughter of James I., king of England. This prince encountered a series of misfortunes. The emperor Ferdinand put him under the ban of the empire, engaged his small army at Prague, and took from him both his crown and his electorate; he fled into Silesia, and thence successively into Holland, to England, and to France. His father-in-law James refused him the smallest assistance, contrary to the importunities of the whole English nation, and to his own personal glory, as he would thus have become the head of the protestant cause in Europe. It was evidently the interest likewise of Louis XIII. to hinder the princes of Germany from being oppressed, and to check the increasing power of the emperor. Yet the elector palatine was refused aid from that quarter also. The Emperor Ferdinand, in a diet held at Ratisbon, declared him fallen from all his estates and dignities, and bestowed his electorate on Maximilian of Bavaria.

The Protestant party, now almost overpowered, chose Christian IV., king of Denmark, to be their chief, but his armies were successively defeated by the imperial generals. The party of the Catholics

were carrying all before them, and everything seemed to promise that Ferdinand would become absolute through the whole of Germany, and succeed in that scheme, which he seemed to meditate, of entirely abolishing the Protestant religion in the empire. But this miserable prospect, both of political and of religious thraldom, was dissolved by the great Gustavus Adolphus, who, being invited by the Protestant princes of Germany to espouse the cause of the reformed religion, was induced to assist them, not only as being himself of that persuasion, but as it was of consequence to his own kingdom of Sweden, to prevent the emperor from obtaining a firm footing upon the Baltic.

Gustavus entered Germany, and drove the imperial army out of Pomerania. He attacked the celebrated General Tilly, and entirely defeated him at Leipsic. The whole country submitted to him, from the banks of the Elbe to the Rhine. He marched triumphant through the whole of Germany, while the Emperor Ferdinand, fallen at once from all his proud pretensions, was reduced so low as to solicit the pope to publish a crusade against the Protestants. On their part all was in a train of success, and the elector palatine was on the verge of being restored to his crown and electorate, when the heroic Gustavus, in the midst of his victories, was killed in the battle of Lutzen. The elector palatine, oppressed with infirmities and misfortune, died of a broken heart. It was the son of this elector, the gallant Prince Rupert, who, together with his brother Maurice, distinguished themselves in the civil wars of England in support of the royal cause, during the reign of their uncle Charles I

After the death of Gustavus, the war, on the part of the Protestants, was carried on by the Swedish generals; and Oxenstiern, the chancellor of Sweden, succeeded his master Gustavus, as head of the Protestant interest. Cardinal Richelieu at the same time declared war against the two branches of the house of Austria, which were attacked at once by France,

Sweden, Holland, and Savoy. Under these distressing circumstances died the Emperor Ferdinand II., during the whole of whose reign the empire had been subjected to all the miseries of foreign war and of civil commotions.

The Austrian power continued still to decline under his son Ferdinand III. The Swedes gained a footing in the empire; and the French supported the Protestant princes with troops and with money. At length Ferdinand III., heartily tired of an unsuccessful war, concluded the peace of Westphalia in the year 1648. In virtue of this celebrated treaty, the Swedes and the French were become the legislators of Germany: the dispute between the emperor and the princes of the empire, which had subsisted for seven hundred years, was at length decided. Germany became a great aristocracy, composed of a monarch, electors, princes, and imperial towns. The Germans were now obliged to pay five millions of rix-dollars to the Swedes, for the aid they had received from them. The kings of Sweden became princes of the empire, and acquired Pomerania with a considerable part of the imperial territories. The king of France was made landgrave of Alsace, and the palatine family was restored to all its rights, except the upper palatinate, which remained with the elector of Bavaria. Above a hundred and forty restitutions were decreed and complied with; and, what was of the greatest importance, the religious dissensions were finally put an end to. The three religions —the Catholic, the Lutheran, and the Calvinist, were equally established. The imperial chamber was composed of twenty-four Protestant members, and twenty-six Catholic, and the emperor was obliged to admit of six Protestant, even in his aulic council at Vienna.*

* What is termed the peace of Westphalia consisted, in fact, of two treaties; the one made at Osnaberg, 16th August, 1648, between the Germans and Swedes; the other, in the same year (25th October,) at Munster, between the Germans and

The peace of Westphalia was the preservation of the German empire, which was otherwise tending headlong to ruin. A war of thirty years' continuance had desolated the country, and destroyed some of the most opulent and flourishing of the towns. The quarrels between the Protestant and Catholic princes must have terminated only by the entire destruction of one party or of the other. Industry was at a stand, agriculture neglected, commerce and manufactures totally annihilated. This salutary peace settled all disputes, and fixed the contending religions, which were the cause of them, up-

the French. The capital proviso is contained in the eighth article of the Treaty of Osnaburg; which, therefore, we shall here transcribe.

"For preventing any disputes that hereafter may arise in the political state, all and every one of the electors, princes, and states of the Roman empire, ought to be so confirmed by virtue of this treaty, in their ancient rights, prerogatives, freedom and privileges, in the free exercise of their territorial rights, in matters ecclesiastical and political in their dominions, in their rights of regality, and in the possession of all these together, that no person may have it in his power to give them actual molestation, on any pretence whatsoever. They shall, without any contradiction, enjoy the privilege of suffrage in all deliberations concerning the right of the empire, particularly when laws are to be made or interpreted, war to be declared, contributions to be imposed, levies of troops to be made, and their quarters regulated; new fortresses to be erected, in the name of the public, in the territories of the states or garrisons to be placed in the old ones; as also when any treaties of peace or alliance are to be concluded, or any other affairs of that nature to be treated; none of these, or others of the like kind, shall be undertaken or permitted without the suffrage and free consent of all the states of the empire, assembled in the diet. They shall, above all things, have the perpetual right of making alliances between themselves and foreigners for their own preservation and security; provided, nevertheless, that such alliances are not directed against the emperor and empire, against the public peace, or against the present transaction in particular; and that they do not in any ways infringe the oath which they have all taken to the emperor and empire.

on an unalterable basis: and from that time Germany, gradually recovering from her wounds and misfortunes, at length became a great, a powerful, and a polished nation.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

FRANCE UNDER LOUIS XIV.—Anne of Austria Regent—Cardinal Mazarin—Condé—Turenne—War of the Fronde—Cardinal De Retz—Treaty of the Pyrenees and of Oliva—Christina, queen of Sweden—Peace of Breda—Wars in Flanders—Triple Alliance—Sabatei Sevi—Louis attacks Holland—Death of Turenne—Peace of Minequar—Revocation of the Edict of Nantes—Louis continues the War in Germany—Peace of Ryswick—Spanish Succession—Prince Eugene—War with England—Marlborough—Battle of Blenheim—Gibraltar taken by the English—Battle of Ramillies—Louis's Schemes in favour of the Stuarts—Successors of the Allies—Battle of Malplaquet—Humiliation of Louis—Battle of Villa Vitiosa restores Philip to the Throne of Spain—Peace of Utrecht, 1713—Peace of Radstadt—Constitution of France under the Monarchy.

LOUIS XIII. had, by his will, appointed a council of regency for the queen, Anne of Austria; but the parliament of Paris, at her desire, annulled the will, and gave her the full administration of the kingdom during her son's minority. Cardinal Mazarin, an Italian of great address, who had gained upon the favour of the queen, soon rose to the office of prime minister, with all the power of his predecessor Richelieu. The Spaniards, judging the minority of the king and the change of the ministry to be a favourable crisis for an attack upon France, marched an army into Champagne, and besieged Rocroi; but they met with a severe check from the young duke D'Enghien, afterward the great Condé; and this victory gained by the French at Rocroi paved the way for a series of triumphs.

Condé pursued his success; he took from the Spaniards the strong city of Thionville, in Luxembourg, and thence marching into Germany, attacked the imperial forces, and signally defeated them at Fribourg, after a battle which lasted three days. The Maréchal Turenne, his competitor for glory, was not at this time so successful. He was defeated by the imperialists at Mariendhal, in Franconia; but Condé, soon after joining his forces to those of the marshal, revenged this disaster by a signal victory at Nordlingen. The details of wars are foreign to our purpose. The peace of Westphalia composed, as we have already observed, the differences between France and the empire. But at this very time a civil war was kindled in Paris, of which the object was the removal of the cardinal Mazarin. The fortune and the power of this minister naturally excited envy, and gave rise to cabals to pull him down; and the mal-administration of the finances, the distresses of the state, and the oppression of the people, by a variety of new taxes, were sufficient to render these discontents universal. The parliament, which saw edicts pronounced for taxes, without being, as usual, confirmed by them, expressed an open and violent disapprobation of Mazarin's measures. The coadjutor to the archbishop of Paris, (afterward the cardinal de Retz,) a man of an impetuous temper, and at the same time of an artful and intriguing character, kindled these discontents into a civil war, to which they gave the name of the Fronde. This, it is believed, is the sole instance of a national rebellion, which had no higher aim than the removal of an unpopular minister. The prince of Conti, brother of the great Condé, the dukes of Longueville, Beaufort, Vendôme, and Bouillon, headed the rebels; and the queen-regent, together with the royal family, removed the court to St. Germain, with a design to besiege the city of Paris and reduce the parliament to submission.

The gay humour of the French, that spirit of levity which turns everything into ridicule, was never

more conspicuous than in this war; a strong contrast to the temper that characterized those civil commotions, which almost, at this very time, had drowned England in blood. The grievances of the English prompted to a serious, a gloomy, and a desperate resistance, which embroiled the whole nation, and ended in the destruction of the constitution. The grievances of the French kindled the civil war of the Fronde, but afforded to this volatile people nothing more than the occasion of an agreeable confusion, and a fit subject for lampoons and ballads. The Parisians marched out to attack the royal army, adorned with plumes of feathers and fine nosegays. The women had as active a share in these proceedings as the men; and the dutchess of Longueville actually prevailed on the great Turenne to leave the king's party, and revolt with his army to that of the rebels. A seeming reconciliation took place for some time, and the court returned to Paris; but the violence of Mazarin, who put the prince of Condé and his brother Conti, with the duke of Longueville, under arrest, threw everything again into disorder. The parliament, provoked at these indignities, passed sentence of perpetual banishment on Mazarin, who left the kingdom; though, by his authority with the queen-regent, he ruled at a distance as absolutely as if he had been at court.

Louis, however, became of age in the year 1652, and the face of affairs was entirely changed. The cardinal de Retz, the chief author of the disturbances, was imprisoned. Gaston, duke of Orleans, the king's uncle, who had been incessantly concerned in all state cabals, was banished; and a perfect calm succeeded the tumults of the Fronde. Mazarin again returned to court, and enjoyed a degree of authority as high as ever.

Condé had carried his rebellion to a greater height than any of the other partisans. He had joined the Spaniards; and he now, in conjunction with the archduke Leopold, laid siege to the town of Arras; but

Turenne marched against him, forced him to raise the siege, and left him nothing but the honour of making a good retreat. On the other hand, Turenne, who had besieged Valenciennes, was compelled to raise the siege by Condé and the Spaniards. With the aid of the English, Turenne now laid siege to Dunkirk. The Spaniards, in fine, lost that important place, which France, according to agreement with Cromwell, ceded to the English, and which, as we have already seen, was sold back to the French during the reign of Charles II. Along with Dunkirk, the Spaniards were deprived of several of their strongest towns in Flanders, and mortified by their losses, concluded, in the year 1659, the celebrated treaty of the Pyrenees.

The principal article of this treaty, besides the cession of several towns on both sides, was, that Louis XIV. should marry the infanta of Spain—with a portion of two millions five hundred thousand livres—in consideration of which, that princess should renounce all rights which she might eventually have to the crown of Spain.

Thus the war was ended in the south of Europe by the treaty of the Pyrenees, and peace was restored to the North in the year following, by the treaty of Oliva.

About this time Christina, queen of Sweden, the daughter of the great Gustavus Adolphus, attracted the attention of all Europe by her voluntary retirement from the cares of government, at the age of twenty-seven. Christina was fond of literature and the fine arts, and to that passion she sacrificed both her crown and her religion. The court of Sweden, while she reigned, instead of statesmen and politicians, was filled with philosophers and learned men: the cares of government were neglected. She spent her whole time in literary conversations, in the study of the learned languages, or in her cabinet of medals, statues, and pictures. It was not extraordinary that a woman of this disposition should wish to retire from the cares

of government, that she might dedicate her whole time to her favourite studies.

The States of Sweden solicited her to marry Charles Gustavus, her cousin. She declined the proposal; but gratified the inclinations of the kingdom by naming him for her successor, and, at a solemn assembly of the States, in the year 1654, she made a formal resignation of the government in his favour. She set out immediately, in man's apparel, for Rome; but soon after left that city for Paris, which she ever afterward distinguished as her principal place of residence. The conduct of this singular woman has been variously judged of: she herself thought it glorious—and her panegyrist Voltaire holds it forth as much to her honour—that she preferred living with men who could *think*, to the government of a people without literature. But how much nobler would it have been for this philosophic queen to have bestowed her attention on the introduction among her subjects of those sciences which tend to the good of mankind! It was an argument of a little soul, to reproach those with ignorance, or barbarism, whom it should have been her study, as it was her duty, to have cultivated and improved. It was not, therefore, surprising that a woman, whose conduct was evidently regulated more by caprice than by a sound understanding, should repent of the step she had taken, and wish to resume that government she had abdicated. Upon the death of her cousin Charles X., she solicited the government from the States of Sweden, without success; and, mortified with the disappointment, she went back to Rome, where she died in the year 1689. The example of Christina, it would appear, had been contagious; for a very short time after her resignation, John Casimir, king of Poland, abdicated his throne, and retired to the Abbey of St. Germain, near Paris, where he passed the remainder of his days; but the conduct of Casimir was more justifiable than that of Christina: he was of a weak constitution, and far advanced in

life. He had been educated a churchman and a man of letters, and though naturally disinclined to the cares of royalty, he sustained the dignity of his kingdom during a pretty long reign, both as an able legislator and as a warrior. He shook off the burden only when age and want of health unfitted him to support it with honour and advantage.

Meantime, Louis XIV. began to display some proofs of a genius which, till now, from the circumstance of a very faulty education, had lain entirely concealed. Mazarin had died in the year 1661, with the honour of having brought about the peace of Westphalia and the treaty of the Pyrenees; and Lewis, whom he had hitherto led about as a child, assumed himself the reins of government. He had borne the yoke of Mazarin with great impatience, and, in some instances, had shown that impetuosity of temper which strongly characterized his disposition. Upon occasion of a meeting of the parliament of Paris, where some of the royal edicts were called in question, Lewis, then a boy of sixteen years of age, entered the hall of parliament in boots, with a whip in his hand; and, confident of the powers of an absolute prince, told them, with an air of high authority, that he was acquainted with the audacity of their procedure, and would take care to restrain them within the bounds of their just prerogatives. Upon the death of Mazarin, the first acts of the administration of Louis were rather violent than politic. An idle dispute about precedency had happened in London between the Spanish and French ambassadors. Louis immediately ordered the Spanish ambassador at Paris to quit the kingdom, and recalled his own from the court of Spain. Philip IV. was threatened with a renewal of the war, unless a proper submission should be made, and an acknowledgment of the precedency of France, to which that monarch was obliged to consent. A similar affront offered to the French ambassador at Rome was followed by a yet more humiliating satisfaction. The pope was

obliged to beg pardon by his legate, and a pillar was erected at Rome to perpetuate the affront and the reparation.

It must be acknowledged that there was something very great and noble in the extent and variety of those measures which Louis pursued for the aggrandizement, the splendour and real advantage of his kingdom. He purchased Dunkirk from the English, and strengthened it with immense fortifications. At one and the same time he despatched an army to the aid of the Emperor Leopold against the Turks; another to the assistance of the king of Portugal against Spain; and a fleet to the aid of the Dutch against the English. Charles II., for the gratification of his people, had undertaken this war against the Dutch, which, after it had been for some time prosecuted with no advantage to the nation, oppressed, at that time, with the dreadful calamity of the fire of London and the miseries of the plague, was concluded by the peace of Breda, in the year 1667.

From the time of Henry IV., the finances of France had been in a very ruinous condition. The abilities of the great financier Colbert now put matters upon a better footing. He granted protections to trade, established free ports, founded an East India Company, and set on foot a variety of useful manufactures in the kingdom. He reduced the interest of money to five per cent. With the assistance afforded him by this able minister, Louis XIV. was in a condition to undertake a great variety of the most splendid and beneficial projects. The construction of the canal of Languedoc, which joins the bay of Biscay to the Mediterranean; the paving of the principal cities throughout the kingdom; the establishment of a regular internal police; the foundation of the Academy of Belles Lettres and Inscriptions, as well as the Academy of Sciences, are all illustrious monuments of the genius and abilities of Louis XIV.

Philip IV., king of Spain, died in the year 1665, and

Louis (though by the treaty of the Pyrenees he had renounced all claim to any part of the Spanish dominions in the right of his wife) now formed a design of seizing Flanders and Franche-Comté. The pretence was, that the money which was stipulated as the queen's portion had never been paid. He made his claim in due form, which was rejected by the queen-regent of Spain, and Louis immediately marched at the head of an army, with Marshal Turenne. into Flanders, where most of the towns surrendered at his approach. The city of Lisle, though strongly fortified, held out only nine days.

After this expedition, terminated with equal celerity and success, Louis returned to enjoy the pleasures and applauses of his court. Yet in the midst of luxury and festivity, he had secretly planned another stroke against the Spanish dominions; and all at once, before the smallest hint of his intentions had transpired, he set out with the prince of Condé and his son the duke D'Enghien, with an army, for the reduction of Franche-Comté. In three weeks he had subdued the whole province, and returned victorious to Paris. These exploits, thus superficially related, would incline us to believe that Louis XIV., a youth at this time of the age of twenty-two, promised to rival in military glory the Cæsars and Alexanders of antiquity; but, should we examine them in detail, we shall find no such heroism of character. In the reduction of Flanders and Franche-Comté, the glory of the conquest was due to Turenne and the engineer Vauban. The monarch of France lived in his camp as much at ease and in as much luxury as in his palace of Versailles. He thought it imprudent to hazard the safety of his royal person at the head of his troops, but kept an elegant court in his tent, where his general officers communicated to him from time to time the operations of the campaign.

Meantime, however, these successes alarmed the rest of Europe. A triple alliance was formed between

England, Holland, and Sweden, to oblige Louis to make peace with Spain, and to relinquish all claim of territory in right of his queen. This alliance put a stop to the progress of the French monarch. The union of these powers was too formidable to be opposed; and a treaty was signed at Aix-la-Chapelle, by which Louis, though he kept part of Flanders, restored Franche-Comté, and confirmed the treaty of the Pyrenees.

After the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, France continued to increase equally in strength and in splendour. Her commerce grew with her navy. Colbert and Louvois laboured with indefatigable industry in the finances and police, and that kingdom became an object of admiration as well as jealousy to foreigners. The active genius of Louis would not suffer him to rest without a foreign enterprise. The Turks had invaded the island of Candia (the ancient Crete), one of the principal possessions of Venice; and Louis sent thither an armament of seven thousand men to the aid of the Venetians. That assistance, however, came too late, and Candia was taken by the Turks under the grand vizier Cuprogli.

A singular affair, which happened at this time in Turkey, excited considerable disturbances in that empire, and brought great confusion upon the Jews in the face of all Europe: this was the detection of the impostor Sabatei Sevi, who pretended to be the Messiah. The Jews at this time confidently expected the coming of the Messiah; as it was supposed that the mystic number 666, which is found in the book of the Revelations, implied that their great deliverer was to appear on earth in the year 1666. Sabatei, who was an enthusiast of considerable talents and address, took advantage of this opinion, and began to preach and perform miracles. Smyrna and Damascus, where he first appeared, were thrown into great confusion. He made converts without number. The Jews every where left off trade, and refused to pay their debts.

Sabatei made a progress through the Turkish empire, followed by immense multitudes of converts. He arrived at Constantinople, and was immediately thrown into prison. The sultan, Mahomet IV., went himself to see him, and immediately proposed to him either to turn Mahometan or be impaled alive. Sabatei wisely chose the former. He now pretended that he had been commissioned by God to substitute the Mahometan for the Jewish religion; but he sunk into contempt; and the Jews who had been his disciples became the objects of scorn and derision in all the European nations.

To return: the aid sent by Louis to the Venetians against the Turks arrived too late: other projects now occupied the monarch of France. Irritated at the Dutch, who, by means of the triple alliance, had checked his designs against the dominions of Spain, Louis now meditated the conquest of Holland, and he took every measure necessary for so great an enterprise. England, Sweden, and the emperor, entered into his views, and formed an alliance to annihilate this republic, which at this time was internally embroiled by civil factions. The grand pensionary, John De Wit, and his brother Cornelius, from an ardent desire of vindicating the liberty of their country, which was in danger from the exorbitant power of the stadtholder, had procured the abolition of that office after the death of William II. His son, William III., naturally aspired to the attainment of his father's dignities, and had formed a powerful party among the states. At this era of division, the great John De Wit, able politician as he was, had attended more to the internal peace and happiness of his country than to the securing her from foreign danger. The marine of Holland was formidable, but the land forces were in a very poor condition.

Upon the first intimation of Louis's design, the command of the fleet was given to the admiral De Ruyter, and that of the land forces to the prince of

Orange. Louis marched into Holland at the head of a prodigious army. In three months, the provinces of Utrecht, Overyssel, and Gueldres were entirely subdued; and the French advanced almost to the gates of Amsterdam. Holland was reduced to the very brink of destruction; and it was seriously proposed to transport the wealth of Amsterdam and its inhabitants to the East Indian colony of Batavia. At the desire of John De Wit, however, a requisition was made for peace; but the terms prescribed by Louis—viz., the destruction of their forts, the giving up all their possessions beyond the Rhine, and abolishing the protestant religion, were conditions to which it was not possible to accede. In this desperate situation, the prince of Orange, in whom the nation reposed the utmost confidence, was at length created stadtholder, and became the principal support of the state. As a last resource, the Dutch broke down the dikes, and letting in the sea upon the level country, threw the whole under water. To this measure, and still more to an alliance which was forming for their protection with Denmark and the elector of Brandenburg, the Dutch owed their rescue from destruction. Louis was content for the present with the glory he had achieved by the conquest of the three provinces of Gueldres, Overyssel and Utrecht. It was impossible for him however to keep them: they were ransomed by the Dutch; and the French monarch, satisfied with the honours of the campaign, returned with great pomp to Paris, where he built the triumphal gate of St. Denis.

The prince of Orange, in the meantime, to revenge the injuries which his country had sustained, exerted his influence with all the powers of Europe. He prevailed with both branches of the house of Austria to join against France, and found means likewise to draw off the English from her alliance. The emperor sent his general Montecuculi with twenty thousand men, and the elector of Brandenburg marched twenty five

thousand to the assistance of the Hollanders. Marshal Turenne commanded an army of twenty thousand French upon the Rhine. With these he beat the Imperialists, and carried havoc and desolation into the Palatinate; but in the prosecution of his successes he was killed by a cannon-ball near Sasbach.* After the death of Turenne, Condé, with forty-five thousand men, attacked the prince of Orange near Mons, in a most desperate engagement, where the victory at last remained doubtful. A singular enterprise was attempted by Marshal Luxemburg. He marched an army of twelve thousand men upon skates, from Utrecht, to attack the Hague; but the project was unfortunately defeated by the coming on of a thaw before they had reached the Hague, which obliged them to return without any effect. In the meantime, Marshal Du Quesne had three naval engagements with De Ruyter, in all of which the event was undecided.

After various and alternate successes by sea and land, a peace was at length concluded at Nimeguen, in the year 1678, much to the honour of France. Franche-Comté was given up by the Spaniards, and it has ever since been annexed to the French domin-

* The fine speech of St. Hilaire (the lieutenant-general of artillery) is well known. The same bullet which killed Turenne carried off his arm; and his son lamenting his misfortune with tears, "Weep not for me," said St. Hilaire: "for that great man we ought all to weep;"—"Paroles comparables," says Voltaire, "à tout ce que l'histoire a consacré de plus héroïque; et le plus digne éloge de Turenne."—"Words, than which history has recorded none more heroic; and worthy to be the eulogy of Turenne." Turenne was indeed a singular character. Every endowment of nature, and every acquirement of education necessary to form the character of a consummate general, seemed to centre in him. His intrepid and enterprising mind was ever under the guidance of a vigorous and penetrating judgment: he never fought for fame, but always with that judicious caution which, though it may lessen the splendour of an enterprise, ensures its success.

ions. Spain likewise surrendered to them almost all the conquered towns in the Netherlands.

During the continuance of this peace, Louis XIV. did not make a prudent use of his good fortune. He still kept up his troops, and, by corrupting the magistrates of Strasburg, found means to seize upon that important city, which exasperated the emperor to such a degree, as almost to rekindle the war. The elector of Brandenburg, however, prevented the union of the Germanic body, and Louis retained his conquest. This most ambitious monarch was in the meanwhile secretly stirring up the Turks to co-operate with the Hungarians in invading the imperial dominions on the quarter of Hungary. The Hungarians were at this time in arms against the court of Vienna, to vindicate their privileges, which the emperor had encroached upon. The allied forces marched up to the gates of Vienna, and laid siege to the city, which was on the point of falling into the hands of the Turks, had not John Sobieski, king of Poland, most seasonably come to its relief. It is almost incredible that the emperor, who had meanly abandoned the city, and fled to Passau, should, at his return to his capital, insist on receiving a submissive homage from the very man to whom he owed the preservation of his dominions. It was not at all surprising that a proposal so absurd should be treated by John Sobieski with suitable disdain.

His intrigues having failed in this quarter, Louis now turned his arms toward Flanders, and his northern frontiers, and while he amused the emperor and the Spaniards in negotiations, he seized upon Courtrai, took and demolished the fortifications of Treves and made himself master of the whole principality of Luxemburg; and having secured these important advantages, he concluded his negotiations by a truce for twenty years. Louis next projected the reduction of the piratical states of Barbary, and received the submission of Algiers, which was soon followed by that of Tunis and Tripoli. Genoa, which had offended by

selling ammunition to the pirates, and building ships for the Spanish navy, was bombarded—one half of this magnificent city was reduced to ashes, and the doge and principal senators were sent to Paris to deprecate the vengeance of Louis.

Theological controversies next engaged his attention, and after a tedious contention with the church of Rome, originating between the Jesuits and Jansenists, Louis now formed a very impolitic project for the extirpation of Calvinism from his dominions. Colbert had protected the Calvinists, from a conviction that they were as useful as any other subjects; but at the death of that able statesman, the most rigorous measures were adopted and pursued. The edict of Nantes had been passed in the reign of Henry IV., giving the protestants liberty of conscience; and had been confirmed by Louis XIII., under certain restrictions with regard to public worship. Louis *revoked the edict:* the whole Huguenot churches were demolished, the ministers banished, and, what was a refinement of persecution, the protestants were at the same time prohibited, under the severest penalties, from quitting the kingdom. That prohibition, however, was ineffectual, and above five hundred thousand people made their escape out of France, and, carrying with them all their property, found a welcome asylum in Germany, Switzerland,* Holland, and England. By this most impolitic measure, France sustained a very severe loss, not only in the article of population, but in commerce and manufactures.

* Voltaire affirms that "there are not less than a thousand families of French refugees settled at Geneva, and to these that city, which formerly only considerable as a school of theology, owes its industry, its manufactures, and its consequent opulence. The Genevese at present are in a capacity of lending to the king of France a sum from which they draw an annual interest of five millions of livres."—*Fragment sur la Révocation de l'Edit de Nantes. Voltaire, Œuvres,* t. xxvi., 4to.

It was much about the same time that a similar excess of intolerant zeal produced, as we have already seen, the fall of the house of Stuart from the throne of Great Britain.

In the year 1692, a remarkable division arose in the empire of Germany, on occasion of the creation of a ninth electorate in favour of the duke of Brunswick-Lunenburg-Hanover. The emperor had given him the investiture; but the princess protested, and would have had recourse to arms, if Leopold had not suspended the creation. It continued to be a subject of dissension till the year 1708, when the states gave their consent to the investiture of the duke of Brunswick, who soon after became king of Great Britain by the title of George I.

In the meantime, Louis carried on the war in Germany, with his son, the dauphin, at the head of his armies. The cities of Heidelburg, Mentz, Philipsburg, Spires, were taken, and the Palatinate was ravaged with fire and sword. Marshal Luxemburg, successful in the Low Countries, defeated King William in the celebrated battles of Steenkirk and Nerwinden, in the year 1692 and 1693. Marshal de Noailles was at the same time victorious in Spain. This period, in short, seems to have been the crisis of the greatness and splendour of Louis XIV., the ultimate boundary of his vast successes.

However flattering these brilliant triumphs had been to the pride of the nation, Louis, who was a very able politician, began at length to perceive that his ambitious views were attended with no solid advantage. The variety and extent of his military enterprises had been attended with a prodigious waste of treasure. He had lost the ablest of his ministers, Colbert; and that excellent arrangement of the finances, which, during his administration, afforded his master the most abundant supplies for the accomplishment of his great designs, had been much relaxed under the management of his successors. Louis, in short,

thought it his most advisable plan to conclude the peace of Ryswick, in the year 1697, of which the conditions, though proposed by himself, were extremely humiliating after such a career of glory. He restored to Spain all that she had lost by the war in Flanders, and all his conquests near the Pyrenees. He restored several towns to the emperor, and the territory of Lorraine to its duke, and finally he acknowledged the prince of Orange king of England. It has been pretended that these concessions were made with a political view, to pave the way for his succession to the crown of Spain, as Charles II. of Spain was then dying, and Louis pretended a title as grandson of Philip III., notwithstanding his mother's renunciation of all right to that crown. But this refined piece of policy is now certainly known to have been all a fiction. The true secret of the humiliating peace of Ryswick, was the exhausted state of France, the enormous expenses of the war, the disorder of the finances, and the murmurs of the people at the increase of taxes for supplying the monarch's various and expensive schemes.

The succession to the kingdom of Spain was, it is true, a subject of great political intrigue. The emperor and the king of France were the natural competitors: while King William of England, apprehensive of such an increase of power, proposed a treaty of partition with France and Holland, by which Spain and all her possessions in America were to be secured to the elector of Bavaria, the two Sicilys to the Dauphin, and the dutchy of Milan to the emperor's second son. This division of his kingdom in his own lifetime naturally irritated the Spanish monarch to a high degree. It occasioned great cabals at the court of Madrid; and Charles II., at length, rather choosing to make a settlement himself of his dominions than to allow them to be disposed of by others, bequeathed by his will the whole monarchy to the duke of Anjou, the Dauphin's second son: and failing the younger

branches of the family of France, to the Archduke Charles, the youngest son of the emperor, but upon condition that the empire and Spain should never be united under the same sovereign. He died soon after. Whether Louis XIV. ought to have agreed to the partition treaty, or accepted the will of the king of Spain, has been disputed by the French politicians, and was seriously deliberated by Louis himself. By the partition treaty, the crown of the two Sicilys and Lorraine would have been added to his dominions, and he might have reckoned upon the assistance of England and Holland against the emperor. By accepting the legacy of the kingdom, he exposed himself to a general war for the establishment of his grandson. The last of the measures, however, he chose; and, contrary to all expectation, instead of a general war breaking out, the whole powers of Europe remained for some time in perfect tranquillity. The duke of Anjou, by the name of Philip V., took possession of his crown, and was acknowledged by the pope, the duke of Savoy, the state of Venice, the northern potentates, and even by Portugal, England, and Holland. These two last powers, however, England, and Holland, considered the Spanish dominions in Italy in a different point of view, and they entered into an alliance with the emperor to detach them from the principal inheritance. This occasioned a war in Italy, in which Prince Eugene commanded the imperial army. This illustrious man was son of the count de Soissons of the house of Savoy, governor of Champagne. In his youth having met with some mortifications at the court of France, he went into the emperor's service, who was then at war with the Turks. Louis, who treated him with disdain, did not at that time foresee that this young man would one day humble his pride, and shake the foundations of his empire.

In the year 1701, James II. of England died at the castle of St. Germains, and Louis was imprudent enough to exasperate the English by recognising the

title of king in his son. The consequence was, that England resolved to prosecute a war against France with the utmost rigour. The death of King William, which happened in the year following, it was hoped by the French, might have been a favourable circumstance, and it was expected that the political system would have been in some measure changed by the accession of Queen Anne. But there was no alteration; the duke of Marlborough, at that time commander-in-chief of the forces of England, confirmed the Dutch in the League formed against France, and a war was declared which brought that kingdom to the lowest ebb of misfortune.

Louis XIV., now in the decline of life, was unable to give that attention to state affairs which he had shown in the vigour of his administration. Military discipline had languished after the death of Luvois and Turenne, and neither the domestic government, the army, nor the state of the nation were correspondent to the former successful years of this reign. The army of the enemy, on the contrary, was commanded by Marlborough and Prince Eugene, who, with great extent both of political and military genius, had the treasures of England and of Holland at their disposal. France had to combat their united forces; and to increase the mortification of Louis, the duke of Savoy changed sides, and sold himself to the emperor. Portugal, likewise, declared against France, and every endeavour was used to dethrone Philip V., and to place the emperor's son upon the throne of Spain. Marshal Villars had, however, with considerable success, opposed the arms of the Imperialists, when he was most imprudently recalled for the pitiful purpose of extinguishing an insurrection of some fanatics in one of the provinces. The duke of Marborough, in the meantime, was carrying everything before him. He took the towns of Venlo, Ruremond, and Liege, and in the following campaign defeated Marshals Tallard and Marin, together with the elector of

Bavaria, in the celebrated battle of Blenheim or Hochstet. The French army, which consisted of sixty thousand men, were completely routed: twelve thousand were killed on the field, and fourteen thousand taken prisoners. Prince Eugene shared the honour of this day with Marlborough. He arrived with his army while the English were in the heat of the engagement, and by this seasonable reinforcement contributed to the victory. The emperor, who by this day's success became master of the electorate of Bavaria, conferred upon the duke of Marlborough the dignity of a prince of the empire, along with the territory of Mindelheim.

The Spanish branch of the house of Bourbon was in the meantime in a state yet more wretched than its parent stock. England and Holland were uniting their utmost efforts in favour of the emperor's son, the Archduke Charles. The English, by a sudden enterprise, took possession of the fort of Gibraltar, which they have kept since that time. It had been in vain battered by the cannon of their fleet, and was at length taken by a few boats stealing unperceived under the Mole, which was scaled by the English sailors, while the Spaniards watched only the operations of the ships-of-war. In six weeks, the English, pursuing their successes, subdued the whole provinces of Catalonia and Valencia.

In Flanders, Marshal Villery had flattered himself that he would yet retrieve the honour of the arms of France, and was impatient till he measured his strength with Marlborough in the field of Ramillies; but the event of this battle was yet more disgraceful to the French, and honourable to the English general, than that of Blenhiem. In one half hour, the French were totally routed, and twenty thousand men left dead upon the field. The consequence of this defeat was the loss of almost all Spanish Flanders.

A short gleam of success attended, however at this time the arms of Louis XIV. in Italy.

The duke of Vendôme had the honour of defeating Prince Eugene at the battle of Cassano, and of forcing that general to retreat into the country of Trent. He was pursuing his successes when he was most imprudently recalled, to replace Marshal Villeroy, in the low countries; and his successor in Italy, far inferior to the trust reposed in him, furnished a counterpart to his conduct by a series of errors, of losses, and misfortunes. The French were defeated at Turin, and the whole country was abandoned to the emperor; while, in the meantime, his son, the archduke, was proclaimed at Madrid; and Philip V., on the point of losing his kingdom, had thoughts of evacuating Spain altogether, and establishing his dominion in America. This desperate resolution, however, was changed upon the victory of Almanza, where the duke of Berwick, the natural son of James II., defeated the Imperialists with their allies, and restored the spirits of the desponding monarch.

The aged Louis, encouraged by this prospect of success, though harassed in so many quarters, had yet spirit enough to think of another ambitious enterprise. This was the establishment of the pretender James upon the throne of Britain. A fleet was fitted out, which was to land him in Scotland, where it was supposed he would meet with partisans sufficient among his countrymen to ensure the success of his cause. But the enterprise was unsuccessful; the squadron appeared upon the coast, but England, being apprized of the project, had made every preparation, and even recalled twelve battalions from Flanders for the protection of the kingdom. James, without landing, returned to France, to wait a more favourable opportunity for the prosecution of his designs.

Misfortunes were now accumulating fast upon the head of Louis XIV. Prince Eugene and Marlborough defeated the French army at Oudenarde, and made themselves masters of Lisle, Ghent and Brussels. In Spain Philip V. was daily losing ground, and the party

of the archduke daily increasing. The Emperor Joseph had even obliged the pope, Clement XI., to acknowledge the archduke king of Spain. The English took Sardinia and Minorca; and the house of Bourbon, both in France and Spain, seemed hastening to its ruin.

The general voice of the kingdom of France was now for peace; and the once haughty Louis, now miserably humbled, sent his minister to negotiate in person at the Hague, where he met with the most mortifying treatment from Marlborough, Eugene, and the Grand Pensionary Heinsius. They demanded nothing less, as a condition of peace, than that the king of France should undertake, at his own charges, to dethrone his grandson Philip, and even limited him to the space of two months for the fulfilling of this condition. The spirit of the aged Louis broke out into the most just indignation, at this inhuman and dishonourable proposal. "Since," said he, "I must die fighting, it shall be with mine enemies, and not with my children." He prepared therefore for a resolute continuance of that war which was only to involve him in fresh misfortunes.

Marlborough and Eugene prosecuted their conquests in Flanders; and the battle of Malplaquet, though attended with greater loss to the allies, was a defeat upon the part of the French, and a new misfortune to the kingdom. Eight thousand of their best troops fell in this engagement, and the consequence was that Louis now found himself reduced to the necessity of entreating conditions equally humiliating with those which had been so arrogantly proposed to him. He offered to extend the Dutch frontier so as to comprehend Lisle and Tournay; to restore Strasburg and Brisac; to fill up the harbour of Dunkirk; to acknowledge the archduke as king of Spain; and to give no assistance to Philip V. With the same inhumanity these offers were rejected, and peace refused, unless upon the condition of his actually dethroning his grandson with his own arms.

At this time the public misery of the kingdom excited universal despair: the army of the archduke had defeated the forces of Philip at Saragossa; and Spain, in the meantime, was invaded by Portugal; when affairs in that quarter most unexpectedly took a sudden turn for the better. Louis, amid all his distresses, had sent the duke of Vendôme to their assistance, and this able general revived the drooping spirits of the nation. An extraordinary exertion was made, and a formidable army was soon in the field, to which the Portuguese and English found themselves perfectly unequal. The victory at Villa Vitiosa restored Philip V. to his capital of Madrid, and put an end to the pretensions of the archduke, who soon after was gratified with the attainment of a higher object of ambition, the succession to the empire by the death of his brother Joseph. Thus Spain was restored to perfect quiet; and France, not long after, obtained that peace which she so earnestly longed for, and so much stood in need of.

A few successes of the French in retaking some of the towns in Flanders would never have produced this beneficial effect, had it not been for the domestic differences of the English and the influence of the court intrigues. The faction of the Whigs, of which Marlborough was the head, had begun gradually to lose their influence at court, principally from this cause, that Queen Anne was disgusted with the imperious and haughty behaviour of the dutchess of Marlborough, who had arrogated to herself the authority and influence of a prime minister. The dutchess was disgraced; the ministry was changed; the Tories came into power, and it was resolved to make a peace with France. This peace was concluded at Utrecht, in several separate treaties, in the course of the year 1713. It was stipulated in the first place, that Philip, king of Spain, should renounce all claim that he ever might have to the kingdom of France; and that his brother, the duke of Berri, should, in like manner, re-

nounce all right to the crown of Spain. The Dutch obtained a considerable frontier; the emperor eight provinces of Spanish Flanders, and had his right secured to the kingdom of Naples and Sardinia; the duke of Savoy got the island of Sicily, with the title of king; the English gained, upon the part of Spain, Gibraltar and Minorca; and France yielded to them the settlements of Hudson's Bay, Newfoundland, and Acadia. Besides these acquisitions in territory, the English insisted for and obtained the demolition of the harbour of Dunkirk, with all its fortifications. All that France obtained which she had not then in her possession was the restitution of Lisle and a few small towns in Flanders. She did not even for a while obtain a complete peace; for the obstinacy of Prince Eugene had prevented the emperor from acceding to the treaty of Utrecht, and the war was continued upon the Rhine till the successes of Marshal Villars forced the emperor and his general at length into conditions; and in the year following a peace was concluded at Radstadt, between Villars and Eugene.

Louis did not long survive the pacification of his empire. He died on the 1st of September, 1715, in the seventy-eighth year of his age. He preserved to the last that courage which characterizes a vigorous mind. The last words which he uttered, as reported by Madame Maintenon, who heard them, were the dictates equally of a wise and a magnanimous spirit: he called to him his grandson the dauphin, who stood by his bedside, and holding him between his arms, gave him his blessing; and said to him, "My son, you are going to be a great king; be always a good Christian. Do not follow my example with regard to war; endeavour to live in peace with your neighbours. Render to God what you owe to Him; follow always the most moderate counsels; endeavour to reduce the taxes, and thus do that which I have unhappily not been able to do. Take notice, my son: these are my last words, and let them sink deep into your mind--

remember that kings die like other men." Such was the end of Louis XIV. The misfortunes of the nation, the enormous expense of an unsuccessful war, and the oppression of those taxes which were necessary to support it, had lessened this great man in the affections of his subjects, who ought not to have overlooked those lasting advantages which they had derived from his government in point of arts and sciences, in the advancement of literature, and all that contributes to heighten the enjoyments of social life.

THE CONSTITUTION OF FRANCE UNDER THE MONARCHY.

To understand the history of France, some acquaintance with its further monarchical constitution, as it existed previous to the Revolution, is necessary to the reader of history. The ancient constitution under the first and second races of its kings, and the political institutions of Clovis and Charlemagne, have already been noticed; and in tracing the history of the kingdom, those changes which gradually took place and insensibly substituted the monarchical for the aristocratical form of its government, have been adverted to; but of these a short recapitulation is necessary to bring the subject into one view.

Under the first or the Merovingian race of the kings of France, we have seen that the royal prerogative was extremely inconsiderable. The general assemblies of the nation, the Champs de Mai and the Champs de Mars, which met annually at stated seasons, possessed the right of electing the kings, of providing them a certain revenue, and of enacting laws for the regulation of the whole community. Under the second or Carlovingian race, the power and authority which the vast abilities of Charlemagne had added to the crown dwindled entirely away in the hands of his weak posterity; and the national assemblies possessed a prerogative and jurisdiction almost as extensive as in the time of his predecessors. But

under the third race of monarchs, termed the Capetian, the constitution had so far changed, that the national assemblies had lost their legislative authority, or at least entirely relinquished the exercise of it. From that period their jurisdiction extended no further than to the imposition of new taxes, the determination of questions respecting a disputed succession to the crown, appointing a regency during the minority of a monarch, and sometimes presenting an humble remonstrance to the sovereign, in the name of the subject, against any measures of the crown which were felt as national grievances. The kings now began gradually to assume the power of legislation, which toward the end of the fourteenth century was considered as a right which resided wholly in the crown. The power of taxation immediately followed; nor does it appear that the first exercise of these rights by the crown without consent of the national assemblies, was attended with the smallest murmur on the part of the people, and these assemblies, now completely stripped of all their valuable powers, were very seldom convoked, and at length entirely laid aside.

Another power, however, insensibly arose, which in some measure supplied their place, in imposing a small restraint and limitation on the amplitude of the regal prerogative; I speak of the French parliaments —and particularly the parliament of Paris. During the feudal government, the parliament of Paris was nothing more than the king's court, to which he committed the supreme administration of justice within his own domains, as well as the power of deciding with respect to all cases brought before it, by appeal from the courts of the barons. As this court was commonly supplied with judges of great ability, and the forms of procedure were better regulated than those of the provincial jurisdictions of the kingdom, of all of which the judges were likewise in the king's nomination, the parliament of Paris gradually acquired a degree

of reputation, dignity, and respect superior to the provincial parliaments. The kings of France, when they first began to assume the legislative power, that they might the better reconcile the minds of the people to this new exertion of prerogative, produced their edicts and ordinances in the parliament of Paris, that they might be approved and registered there before they were published and declared to be of authority through the kingdom. The monarchs were likewise accustomed to consult with this court with respect to the most arduous affairs of government, and frequently regulated their conduct by its advice in declaring war, making peace, or in other matters of public concern. Thus by degrees the nation began to look upon the parliament of Paris as the supreme depository of the laws of the kingdom, and as a body which divided in some respects the powers of sovereignty with the monarch, and was a check upon any violent abuse or exorbitant stretch of his authority: and the parliament, availing itself of this general belief, and naturally disposed to extend its own powers and prerogatives, at various times made a bold stand for the liberties of the people, ventured to question the right of the monarch to lay on arbitrary impositions, and frequently refused to verify and register his edicts.

Yet, strictly speaking, the parliament of Paris must be considered as having usurped these powers, to which, from the original constitution of that assembly, they had no legal right. In fact, they were nothing more than a supreme court of justice; they were in no shape the representatives of the people. They were a set of judges nominated by the king, paid by him, and removable by him at pleasure from their office. The practice of registering and verifying the royal edicts in this court was, as we have already observed, introduced by the monarchs to reconcile the people to that change of the constitution which gave the king the sole legislative authority. We know for certain that when this practice first began, the parlia-

ment acted as a mere official instrument, and never pretended to refuse to register or give their sanction to any edict which was presented to them. Even after the lapse of above two centuries, since they first assumed the right of questioning and refusing to verify the royal edicts, they possessed in reality no power to maintain and defend this privilege. When the parliament refused to give its sanction to any of the royal edicts, the king had only to repair in person to the hall where they were assembled, and command the edict to be read, verified, and registered; and the order of the sovereign must have been obeyed; for it was one of the fundamental laws of the French monarchy that, in the presence of the king, the function of every magistrate is suspended for the time.

Yet even these powers of the parliament of Paris, though they could thus be defeated by the sovereign, were no inconsiderable restraint upon his authority. They effectually prevented that authority from degenerating into absolute despotism, at least, by opposing every encroachment of the crown, and by giving the alarm to the nation when any measure was attempted to be carried into execution which would have proved a serious grievance. The parliament of Paris was frequently broken for a contumacious resistance to the will of the monarch, and its members driven into banishment; but it happened in general that the measure which had been the cause of their resistance was abandoned by the prince, and the nation was thus delivered from a grievance against which otherwise they could have had no redress.

The constitution of the provincial parliaments, which were twelve in number, was in every respect the same with that of the parliament of Paris. It was necessary that the king's edicts should be registered by them before they became of general force. They were the chief courts of justice in the province, and some of them acted likewise in a ministerial ca-

pacity, as the parliaments of Burgundy, Brittany, Dauphine, Provence, Languedoc, and French Flanders, who, when the king thought fit to raise a new tax or assessment upon the province, settled the proportions payable by individuals, and directed the mode of levying it.

The king of France was then to be considered as an absolute prince, but whose authority was at the same time considerably restrained by the consuetudinary regulations of the kingdom, and could not easily become entirely despotic or tyrannical. The crown was hereditary, but it could not pass to a female—nor to a natural son, though legitimated; and it was settled by a royal edict in 1717, that upon the total failure of the line of Bourbon, the crown should be elective, the choice lying in the states of the kingdom, clergy, nobility, and citizens.

The royal revenue was computed to be about three hundred millions of livres, or twelve millions three hundred thousand pounds sterling; but it must necessarily have varied considerably according to the pleasure of the monarch, for it consisted of two separate funds, one of which was fixed, and the other arbitrary The fixed or ordinary revenue of the crown comprehended the royal domains, or the king's patrimonial lands, lordships, and forests; the duty on wine, called the *aids;* the duty on salt, called the *gabelle;* the land-tax, or *taille;* the *capitation*, or poll-tax; and the gift of the clergy, who, so late as the year 1753, purchased away their ancient tax of the twentieth penny, by obliging themselves to pay a yearly sum of twelve millions of livres, or five hundred thousand pounds sterling. The extraordinary or arbitrary revenue of the crown consisted in such other taxes as the monarch thought proper to impose, and the money arising from the sale of offices, which was a very large fund. Most of those duties we have mentioned are leased out to the farmers-general of the revenue,

who paid a settled sum to the crown, and appointed their under-farmers and receivers.*

With respect to the ecclesiastical constitution of France, the Gallican church, though Catholic, and acknowledging the pope as supreme head in matters spiritual, had greatly limited his power within the kingdom. The declaration of the assembly of the clergy of France, signed in the year 1682, bears that the sovereign power in all temporal matters is in no shape subject to the power of the pope, which extends only to matters relative to salvation; that no temporal power can be deposed by the pope, nor subjects absolved from their allegiance to their lawful prince by his authority; that the pope himself is subject to the general councils of the church, which are to be obeyed in preference to his mandates; that the canons which are enacted by those general councils are the supreme rule of obedience in all matters ecclesiastical; and that the judgment of the pope in matters of faith is not infallible, unless it is supported by the assent of the catholic church, declared in a general council. In consequence of these regulations, neither the sovereign, his officers nor magistrates, were subject to any church discipline, either inflicted by the bishops or by the pope himself. The pope had no other jurisdiction in France than such as the king was pleased to grant him. No appeals were competent to the see of Rome, unless in a very few ecclesiasiastical cases, specially defined: no subject could be summoned to Rome; no legate from the pope could act in France without the royal license;

* The history of the French finances may be best understood from the following books:—a small work published in 1599, under the administration of Sully, entitled, "Recueil des Réglemens, Edicts, Ordonnances, et Observations sur le facit des Finances;" and the "Comptes Rendus des Finances du Royaume sous Henri IV., Louis XIII., et Louis XIV.," by M. Mallet, printed at London in 1789, which contains an introduction of great merit, inquiring into the origin of the several taxes, and the ancient management of the revenues.

nor could the pope levy any money from the kingdom unless those small fees and imposts which are decreed to be payable to the see of Rome by the Concordat, a decree of a general council of the catholic church. The ecclesiastical power in France was, in fact, subordinate to the civil; for in all church matters where there was any suspicion of an abuse or an unjust sentence, it was competent to appeal from the ecclesiastical courts to the parliaments, where the matter was determined as a civil cause.

CHAPTER XXXV.

PETER THE GREAT, CZAR OF MUSCOVY, AND CHARLES XII. OF SWEDEN:—Origin of the Russian Empire—Siberia conquered—Rapid extension in Asia—Peter the Great—Forms the first small body of regular Troops—Equips a Fleet—Travels in search of Knowledge—Returns to Russia—His vast Innovations—Charles XII. of Sweden—Confederacy against—Defeats the Russians in the Battle of Narva—Invades Poland—Takes Warsaw and Cracow—Places Stanislaus on the Throne—Invades the Ukraine—Is defeated at Pultowa—Taken Prisoner by the Turks—Returns to his Dominions—Killed at Fredericksha1—Character—Peter the Great puts his Son to Death—Death of Peter—Internal Improvements of his Empire.

DURING the latter part of the reign of Louis XIV., two most illustrious characters had begun to figure in the north of Europe—Peter the Great, Czar of Muscovy, and Charles XII., king of Sweden. To the vast empire of Russia we have hitherto paid no attention, because till now, it was quite uncivilized, and had scarcely any connexion with the European kingdoms. Its early history is still very obscure. Till the middle of the fifteenth century, the Russians were an unconnected multitude of wandering tribes professing dif-

ferent religions, and most of them yet idolaters. A sovereign, or duke of Russia, paid a tribute to the Tartars of furs and cattle, to restrain their depredations. Ivan Vassilovich, a spirited chief, rescued them from this subjection. About the middle of the fifteenth century he increased his dominions by the accession of Novogorod and of the territory of Moscow, which he took from the Lithuanians; and from that period the Russian czars or princes began to assume the splendour and dignity of sovereigns, but their dominions were barbarous and uncultivated. It was not till the year 1645, when Alexis Michaelowitz succeeded to the throne, that the first code of Russian laws was published, and some attempts were made to introduce that civilization which was afterward so happily accomplished by his son Peter the Great. The limits of the empire at this time, too, did not comprehend one third of what is now subject to the dominion of the sovereigns of Russia.

Till about the end of the sixteenth century, the dominions of Russia were bounded by the river Wolga to the east, that is to say—they extended no farther than the limits of Europe. At that time a Cossack chief of the name of Jermack, who followed the profession of a robber, and was the leader of a gang of banditti, was the means of adding to the Russian empire all that immense tract of country known by the name of Siberia. He had long infested the Russian borders by his depredations, till at last being taken prisoner with the greatest part of his followers, and condemned to suffer death, he threw himself upon the clemency of the czar, and offered, on condition of receiving pardon, to point out an easy conquest of an immense extent of empire unknown to the Russians. His offer was accepted, the czar approved of the expedition, and Jermack set out as the general of a regular army for the conquest of Siberia, then in the hands of the Tartars. This expedition was attended with all the success that could be wished. The Tar-

tars fled before the Russians; but venturing at length to make a stand, a general and decisive battle was fought near the city of Tobolsky, where the Tartars were entirely defeated, and their king with the whole of the royal family were sent in chains to Moscow. They were, however, very honourably treated, and the son of the last prince had an assignment of territory of a large extent given him in Russia, which is at this day, or has very lately been, enjoyed by his family, together with the title of Sibersky Czarovitz, or Prince of Siberia. The Russians continued to extend their conquests to the east with great rapidity, and in half a century found themselves confined only by the eastern limits of the Asiatic continent.

The czar Alexis Michaelowitz, who first introduced a regular system of laws among the Russians, paved the way for that civilization which his son Peter afterward accomplished. Alexis left three sons, Phædor, Ivan, and Peter, and a daughter Sophia. Phædor succeeded his father, but died young in the year 1682, leaving the crown to his youngest brother Peter, then only two years of age, in exclusion of the elder Ivan, a man of no capacity; but the princess Sophia had that capacity which her brother wanted. She committed some dreadful excesses to obtain the government of the empire, and carried the point so as to cause herself to be associated with her brothers in the regency; but this did not satisfy her. She aimed at an exclusive possession of the sovereignty, and for that purpose formed a conspiracy against the life of Peter, which terminated in her own ruin. The young Peter assembled some troops, severely punished the conspirators, confined Sophia in a monastery, and, leaving only an empty title to his brother Ivan, made himself master of the empire in the year 1689.

The rudeness and imperfection of Peter's education, and some early habits of intemperance and debauchery, did not prevent him from very soon exhibiting proofs of that genius by which he was so remarkably char-

acterized. An acquaintance with a young foreigner of the name of Le Fort, by birth a Swiss, and a man of penetrating genius, infused those first ideas of improvement into the mind of the czar, and gave birth to a variety of designs for the cultivation and refinement of his people. The first objects of his attention were the army and the marine. The Strelitzes, a body of militia consisting of about thirty thousand men, like the Turkish Janizaries, had frequently embroiled the empire by their seditions. Peter determined to abolish entirely this dangerous body, and for that purpose began with the formation of a regiment which, by degrees, he increased to the number of twelve thousand men. To set an example of subordination to his nobility, he served himself in the quality of a private soldier; thence advancing gradually to the rank of captain and general officer. In the formation of this first body of regular troops, he owed a great deal to the assistance of an able person, of the name of Gordon. He, at the same time, with the help of foreign workmen, constructed a small fleet, and resolved to make an early experiment of his power, by laying siege to Azoph, then a Turkish settlement, at the head of the Black sea, upon the mouth of the Don or Tanais. The enterprise was successful; he defeated the Turkish fleet, and made himself master of Azoph—upon the reduction of which he celebrated a triumph at his return to Moscow.

The genius of Peter was soon sensible, that it was not at home he was to learn those arts which were necessary for the cultivation of his empire. He resolved, therefore, to travel in search of knowledge through the different countries of Europe, and thence to bring home whatever might be of use or importance toward the prosecution of this great design. He named three ambassadors, Le Fort, and two of his nobility, who were to be the ostensible characters at the several courts which he intended to visit, while he himself appeared as a private man in their suite. He

began his journey by Livonia, and from thence, passing through Germany, took up his residence for some time in Holland, where he applied himself, with the assiduity even of a common mechanic, to the acquisition of those useful arts in which his country was most deficient. He studied the art of ship-building by working in the docks with his own hands. He lived with the ship-carpenters, clothed himself like them, and confined himself to the same diet and the same hours of labour. To the practice of these arts, he joined the knowledge of their theory, by studying with great attention the principles of mathematics and mechanics. He attended the lectures given at Amsterdam in natural philosophy, and the schools of anatomy and surgery; in short, he laboured with unremitting industry to acquire a knowledge of all the useful arts and sciences. Russia, indeed, was very late in being civilized; but as the civilization of this empire was not owing, as in other nations, to a gradual progress of society, but was effected at once by the genius of a single man, who introduced the arts and sciences among them in their highest perfection; it has hence happened, that the Russians have made more progress in a century, than any other nation seems ever to have done in double, or even treble the space of time. Ship-building, at the period in question, had been brought to greater perfection in England, than in any other nation in Europe. Thither Peter went, in the year 1693, still as a private man, in the suite of his ambassadors. He was there employed, as he had been in Holland, in the constant observation and acquirement of everything that might tend to the improvement of his empire. The founding of cannon; the art of printing; of papermaking; the construction of clocks and watches; everything attracted his attention. During his residence, both in Holland and in England, he engaged several ingenious artists to accompany him at his return to his own dominions. He cultivated a particular acquaintance with Mr. Fergu-

son, an excellent geometrician, and Mr. Perry, not less eminent as an engineer. The former he employed in the institution of the Marine Academy at Petersburgh, and the latter in the construction of navigable canals, and many noble bridges in various parts of his dominions.

Meantime, the absence of the czar had given occasion to some disturbances in the empire. The spirit of innovation which he had already shown, and the further fruits expected from his foreign travels, gave great disgust to a barbarous people wedded to their ancient manners. The ambition of Sophia fomented these disquiets, and the Strelitzes had determined to place that princess upon the throne. At this important juncture, Peter returned to Russia; he found it necessary to make a most severe exertion of his power; and he took that opportunity of entirely annihilating that dangerous body of the Strelitzes, who by this revolt furnished him with a just pretext. They had marched in arms to Moscow. The regular troops of the czar, headed by Gordon, and another foreign officer, attacked and totally defeated them; a vast number were slain; their leaders who were taken prisoners were broken upon the wheel; two thousand were hanged upon the walls of Moscow and on the side of the high roads, and the rest banished with their wives and children into the wilds of Siberia. Thus the whole of this formidable body was destroyed, and their name abolished for ever. The astonished Russians beheld this dreadful example with silent terror, which paved the way for an easy submission to all those innovations which the czar afterward made in the constitution, police, laws, and customs of his empire.

He now levied regular regiments upon the German model; taught the soldiers a different form of exercise, gave them new arms, and a commodious uniform. The sons of the *boyars*, or nobility of Russia, before arriving at the rank of officers, were now obliged to

rise step by step from the rank of common soldiers, and the same became the law of his marine promotions. He established a new system of the finances, and introduced a thorough reformation into the church, suppressing the dignity of patriarch, which had frequently struggled for an authority superior to the crown. He took from the bishops all civil and criminal jurisdiction, and established a new set of ecclesiastical canons and regulations; one of the most useful of which was, that no man or woman should embrace a monastic life before the age of fifty.

While this truly great genius was thus employed in new modelling the most extensive, and polishing and refining the most barbarous empire in the world, a competitor was arising, who was to dispute with him the dominion of the North, and who rivalled the fame of the most celebrated conquerors of antiquity. This was Charles XII., king of Sweden.

This monarch had succeeded his father in the year 1697, when only fifteen years of age. The most striking feature of his disposition at that time was a most impetuous, haughty temper. He was averse to all manner of study, and, consequently, had very little of the benefits of education; yet the situation of his kingdom very soon unveiled his talents and temperament.

Three powerful enemies joined in a league to oppress him. Sweden was then in possession of the territories of Estonia and Livonia; and Charles XI., his father, had violated the privileges of the Livonians, which they had asserted by a deputation, at the head of which was a nobleman of the name of Patkul, who had incensed the monarch by too bold a remonstrance in favour of the liberties of his country; he was condemned to death, but he escaped, and denounced a signal vengeance against the king of Sweden; he found means to persuade Augustus, king of Poland, and the czar Peter, that they had now an opportunity of recovering, during the weakness of that monarchy

all the provinces they had formerly lost. They were joined by Frederick IV., king of Denmark, and it was not doubted that Sweden would fall a victim to so formidable an alliance.

It was the opinion of Charles's counsellors that a negotiation should be set on foot, to avert the impending ruin; but the king himself instantly gave orders to prepare for war. "I shall attack the first," said he, "who declares against me, and by defeating him I hope to intimidate the rest." From that time Charles dedicated his life to a series of fatigues and dangers, and enjoyed not a moment of ease or relaxation.

The king of Denmark began by the attack of Holstein, while the king of Poland poured down upon Livonia, and the Russians upon Ingria. Charles XII. immediately landed upon the island of Zealand, on which is situated Copenhagen, and carried on his military operations with such vigour, that the capital of Denmark was on the point of being taken. Frederick thought himself happy to save his kingdom by purchasing a peace, and indemnifying the duke of Holstein. Charles, now impatient to be revenged on the czar, hastened into Ingria with an army of nine thousand men. The Russians, to the number of sixty thousand, had laid siege to Narva; the Swedes attacked them in their intrenchments; a signal defeat ensued, and thirty thousand were taken prisoners, together with their whole baggage and artillery. Such was the first campaign of Charles XII., who was then only in the seventeenth year of his age.

The reflection of Peter the Great upon this occasion was extremely noble: "We must make our account,' said he, "that the Swedes will long continue superior to us; but they will teach us at last to conquer them;' and the event justified his prediction.

Meantime Charles determined to make the king of Poland feel his power, as he had done his brothers of Denmark and Russia; he reduced Courland, crossed Lithuania, and penetrated into the heart of his do-

minions. He might have conquered the country; but to have maintained it in subjection would have required such a military force to be constantly kept up as Charles could not afford. He, therefore, adopted another plan. This was to depose the present monarch, Augustus, and place another upon the throne. His designs were seconded by the miserable state of Poland, from the constitution of its government. The people were under the most absolute slavery to their nobles; and these, independent of the crown, were constantly at war with each other; the state had no principle of union, but was subject to all the abuses of the ancient Gothic governments; and to add to these, the primate of the kingdom, Cardinal Rajouski, secretly meditated a revolution, and entered immediately into the views of the king of Sweden. Charles, with little difficulty, made himself master of Warsaw in the year 1702. Augustus was then at Cracow; and being resolved to come to an action, was defeated at Clissaw, by an army which was only half his number. Cracow was taken, and the whole country gave way to the conqueror. The perfidious primate, in an assembly of the states at Warsaw, now openly took part against the king his master; and in the year 1704 the throne of Poland was declared vacant. The victorious Charles signified to the states of the kingdom his desire that Stanislaus Lecksniski, a young nobleman of Posnania, should be elected king. The electors made some hesitation on account of his youth. "If I am not mistaken," said Charles, "he is as old as I am." It is almost needless to add, that Lecksniski was elected king of Poland.

Meantime the arms of the czar had been victorious in Ingria—he had reduced all that province to subjection: but in Poland he was quite unfortunate in his design to re-establish the dethroned Augustus. In that country the Russians were everywhere defeated. Charles was lord of the whole kingdom, and likewise of Saxony, which he laid under very heavy contribu

tions. Augustus was driven to despair, and secretly sued for peace. The conditions prescribed by Charles were, that he should renounce his crown, acknowledge King Stanislaus, and deliver up Patkul the Livonian, who was then with him in the quality of ambassador from the czar. To these terms Augustus shamefully submitted. Charles even obliged him to write a complimentary letter to Stanislaus, wishing him joy upon his accession to the throne. The unfortunate Patkul was given up to the king of Sweden, who, with great inhumanity, and even the highest injustice, condemned him to be broken alive upon the wheel. This action is the greatest stain upon the memory of Charles, who ought to have respected that unhappy man for the very circumstance which was his offence—a noble interposition in behalf of the liberties of his country. Still more ought he to have respected the sacred character which he bore of the czar's ambassador.

Charles now concluded a peace with Augustus, who retired to his electoral dominions of Saxony, and Stanislaus was seated on the throne of Poland, when the czar was very near causing the election of a third sovereign to that kingdom. A diet was actually held for that purpose, when a negotiation was set on foot by the French minister in Saxony to reconcile the Swedes and Russians. Charles abruptly broke off all treaty, by bluntly declaring that he would negotiate with the czar in his capital of Moscow; a piece of presumption to which, when reported to Peter the Great, that monarch replied, "My brother Charles wants to play the part of Alexander, but he shall not find in me a Darius."

This period was, in fact, the crisis of the good fortune of Charles XII., and from this time we view him scarcely in any other light than that of an impetuous and obstinate madman.

At the head of forty-five thousand men he entered Lithuania, and carrying everything before him, was in the way of making good his promise of a visit to the

capital of Moscow. But instead of pursuing this direct route, he turned southward into the Ukraine, the country of the Cossacks, situated between Little Tartary, Poland, and Moscovy. This country he expected soon to subdue, and then to fall upon the capital of Russia. An old chief of the Cossacks, a traitor to his sovereign the czar, had inspired Charles with this fatal resolution, by promising to join him with an army, and to furnish him with all necessary supplies. Charles advanced; but the Cossacks were disobedient to their chief, and refused to depart from their allegiance. The Swedes began to be in want of provisions, and a reinforcement expected from Livonia was cut off by the czar's army. In this desperate situation, the Swedes, in the depth of winter, were making their way through the country of an enemy, exposed to daily attacks, and in want of every necessary supply. Under all these disadvantages, however, Charles crossed the whole country of the Ukraine, and laid siege to Pultowa, from whence he expected to pursue his march to Moscow, and to overturn the imperial throne of Russia. But the famous battle of Pultowa put an end to all his hopes. The two monarchs equally signalized their courage and abilities, but the czar was victorious. Nine thousand Swedes were killed on the field, and fourteen thousand taken prisoners, with a loss upon the part of the Russians of only one thousand three hundred men. Charles, a fugitive, with a few followers, crossed the river Dneiper, and sought an asylum in the dominions of the grand seignior.

The czar now made haste to restore Augustus to the throne of Poland. He entered into a league with that prince, the king of Denmark, and the elector of Brandenburg, the first *king* of Prussia; and, making the best profits of his victory, he made himself master of Finland and Livonia.

Let us now mark the conduct of Charles. In Sweden, where it was not known whether their king was

dead or alive, the regency had thoughts of capitulating with the czar. When Charles heard of this proposal, he wrote to the senate that he would send them one of his boots to govern them. With his feeble train of followers, who amounted only to one thousand and eight hundred men, he formed a small camp near Bender, from whence he endeavoured to prevail with the court of Constantinople to arm in his favour against the Russians. Many successive negotiations were employed for that purpose, and as often defeated by the viziers of the grand seignior, who had no inclination to embroil their country in a war against so formidable an empire. At length, the ministers of Charles prevailed; and the Turks, according to a practice not unfrequent among them, began hostilities by imprisoning the Russian ambassador. The czar hastened his preparations; and, deceived by the governor of Moldavia, as Charles had been before by the chief of the Cossacks, he advanced into that country in the expectation of a revolt in his favour, where he found everything, instead of friendly, wearing the appearance of the most determined hostility. The Ottoman army, amounting, as is said, to above two hundred thousand men, surrounded him, and cut off all communication with his expected reinforcements of troops and provisions. In this desperate situation, he was at length reduced to the necessity of capitulating with the sultan's grand vizier.

When Charles heard of this capitulation, which put an end to his hopes of aid against the Russians, his rage amounted to phrensy. He had kept himself during three years and a half in his camp at Bender, in expectation of that declaration of war which he had at last obtained; and he now saw in an instant a peace concluded, which left him, in a manner, a prisoner with the Turks, without the hope of changing his situation for the better. The grand seignor had, with much generosity, defrayed the whole expenses which Charles had incurred while in his dominions,

which, from the uncommon profusion of that prince, were excessive. He now, with the same generosity offered him a large sum, with an escort of troops to conduct him safely to his own dominions. This offer Charles rejected with the utmost disdain; and he now conceived a resolution, desperate almost beyond credibility. It was to no purpose that he was assured by the officers of the grand seignior, that if he delayed to depart from their dominions, he would be compelled by military force. He braved the whole power of the Ottoman empire, and declared his determined purpose to defend his little camp to the last drop of his blood. His own officers employed supplications, remonstrances, and at length menaces, to make him depart from this frantic design. Charles was inflexible; and the slender remains of his army, who, by desertions, were now reduced to three hundred men, were determined not to abandon their sovereign. They fortified the camp in the best manner possible. The Turkish general astonished at so daring a resolution, gave them three days to deliberate whether to die or capitulate. At the end of the third day, the Swedes were as resolute as ever. The attack was begun, and the intrenchments, invested at once on every quarter, were broken in an instant. A small house within the camp became the citadel and last resort of Charles and his intrepid Swedes. Their number was now reduced to a very few, whom personal regard attached to their sovereign. They did not fail, however, to remonstrate with him against the madness of his resolution; and, in consulting how to sustain a siege in this last retreat, there was but one man who declared a positive opinion that the place might be defended. This was his majesty's cook. "Then, sir," says the king, "I name you my chief engineer." They now proceeded to barricade the doors and windows, and kept up an incessant fire from within upon the whole Turkish army. The besiegers exasperated at length at the numbers killed

by this handful of madmen, threw fire upon the roof of the house, which in a moment was all in flames. It was now necessary to quit their post—a desperate sally was made; and this handful of Swedes, armed with their swords and pistols, were cutting their passage through an army of several thousand men, when Charles, entangled with his spurs, and accidentally falling to the ground, was surrounded by a body of janizaries. In short, the whole troop, after making an incredible carnage, were seized and taken prisoners. An attempt of this kind is only to be paralleled in the romances of knight-errantry.

This obstinacy and infatuation was the occasion of the loss of Charles's dominions in Germany, and almost of his kingdom of Sweden. The czar, King Augustus, the king of Denmark, and the elector of Hanover, entered into an alliance, and wrested from him all the conquests formerly gained by Gustavus Adolphus.

Charles, now a prisoner near Adrianople, was at length willing to return to his own dominions, and desired the grand seignior's permission for what he before so obstinately refused. After having remained above five years in Turkey, he set out in the beginning of October, 1714. Dismissing his Turkish escort on the frontiers, and parting even from his own people, he travelled in disguise, with two of his officers, through the whole of Germany. He arrived at length at Stralsund in Pomerania, one of the most important of his towns upon the Baltic. He knew the designs of Denmark and Prussia to attack this city, and he prepared for a vigorous defence. An incident is recorded of this siege which strongly marks the character of Charles. The town was bombarded, and a shell penetrated the roof of his house, and fell into the apartment where he was dictating his despatches. The secretary, terrified out of his senses, having let fall his pen—"Go on," said the king gravely; "what has the bombshell to do with the letter which I am

dictating?" The city, however, was taken, and Charles obliged to escape in a small bark to Carlescroon, where he passed the winter. At this time he had not seen his capital of Stockholm for fifteen years. In this situation, in which any other monarch would have thought of providing as well as possible for the security of what remained of his kingdom, Charles projected to wrest the kingdom of Norway from Denmark. He invaded that country with an army of twenty thousand men; but having failed to provide for their subsistence, he was obliged very soon to abandon the enterprise. He had at this time for his prime minister the Baron de Gortz, a native of Franconia, a man of an artful, active, and very comprehensive genius. His fertile head had projected an immense revolution, of which the first step was to conclude a peace and alliance with the czar. George I., king of England, had purchased Bremen and Verden, with their dependancies, from the king of Denmark. Gortz's plan was not only to deprive George of these provinces, but to set the pretender James upon the throne of England. The czar, who was to be secured in all his conquests, readily joined in the scheme; and the Swedish minister at the court of London was promoting the conspiracy among the Jacobites of England, when the plot was discovered by intercepted letters. Charles, however, and the czar continued their negotiations, and matters, notwithstanding this discovery, would probably have been brought to an issue by an open declaration of war on their parts against England, but for one fatal event, which broke all their measures. The king of Sweden, in the prosecution of his views against Norway, had laid siege to Frederickschal in the middle of winter. Walking on the parapet of one of his batteries, and in conversation with his engineer, he was struck on the head with a cannon ball, and instantly expired.

His character, in a few words, is well summed up

by Voltaire. He carried all the virtues of a hero to that excess that they became as dangerous as their opposite vices. The obstinacy of his resolution occasioned all his misfortunes in the Ukraine, and kept him five years in Turkey. His liberality degenerating into profusion ruined his kingdom of Sweden. His courage pushed to temerity was the occasion of his death. His justice often amounted to cruelty; and in the last years of his life the maintenance of his authority approached to tyranny. His many great qualities, of which a single one might have immortalized another prince, were the ruin of his country. He never was the first to attack, but he was not always as prudent as he was implacable in his revenge. He was the first who had the ambition to be a conqueror without the desire of aggrandizing his dominions. He wished to gain empires only to give them away. His passion for glory, for war, and for revenge, prevented his being a good politician, a quality, without which there can be no great conqueror. Before he gave battle and after he gained a victory he was all modesty; after a defeat he was all resolution, rigid to others as to himself; counting for nothing the fatigues or the lives of his subjects any more than his own. He was, in short, a singular man rather than a great one; a character more to be admired than imitated. His life ought to teach kings how much a pacific government is superior to the acquisition of the greatest glory.

The kingdom of Sweden gained by the death of Charles. She recovered her liberty by the abolition of the arbitrary power of her sovereigns, and new-modelled the form of her government. His sister succeeded him in the throne, and raised to it her husband Frederick the Landegrave of Hesse Cassel.

The following was the form prescribed for the Swedish government in future. The legislative authority was to be in the diet, which consisted of a certain number of deputies chosen by the nobles, the

clergy and the burgesses, and even the peasantry. The executive power was properly in the senate, composed of sixteen persons, where the king presided, and had only the casting vote in certain cases. It was the diet which named to vacancies in the senate, by presenting three subjects for the king to choose one. The principal employments, both civil and military, were filled up by the senate from the king's recommendation. The diet was appointed to be held every three years, in the month of January. If it were not assembled at the usual time, everything done in the interval was declared to be null. They could not declare war without the king's consent. When assembled they could neither conclude peace, truce, nor alliance, without his consent. All laws and ordinances were appointed to be published in the name of the king: but if he absented himself, or delayed his signature too long, the senate were empowered to supply the want of it and sign for him. On ascending the throne, he must take the oath of government before the diet, and was to be declared an enemy of the states, an *ipso facto* deprived of the throne, in case he violated his engagements.

When the new government was established, the great plans of the Baron de Gortz were of necessity laid aside. He was adjudged a traitor to his country, for having projected a dangerous war when the nation was exhausted and ruined; and he lost his head for the bad counsel he had given to his late sovereign. The states of Sweden concluded a peace with the king of England, to whom as sovereign of Hanover, they ceded for a sum of money the dutchies of Bremen and Verden. They likewise made peace with Denmark, and soon after with the czar, who kept all the provivces he had won.

Peter the Great, ever intent on projects of real utility, was at this time preparing for an expedition into Persia, with the design of securing the command of the Caspian sea, and thus bringing the commerce of

Persia, and a part of India, unto Russia. In 1722, he had gained three provinces of the Persian empire, by concession of the Sophi, to secure his protection against a usurper. Peter was at this time far advanced in life, and was without a child. His only son, Alexis Petrowitz, he had put to death some time before, in a very tragical manner. This youth would have undone all the works of his father. He was a barbarian by nature. He had declared himself an enemy to all improvement and innovation, and consumed his life in the practice of the meanest debaucheries. His father, seeing his disposition to be incorrigible, had ordered him to go into a monastery. The son corresponded with others as disaffected as himself. He was at length arrested and condemned by the voice of one hundred and forty judges, to suffer death as a traitor.

Peter the Great died in the year 1724, and was succeeded by the czarina Catharine, formerly a young Livonian captive, whom he had taken in his first expedition into those provinces, and who certainly possessed merit equal to the station to which she was raised.

Besides these various establishments, which we have already taken notice of as made by this illustrious man, in the beginning of his reign, he had during the course of it accomplished a variety of the most useful designs. A court of police was erected at St. Petersburgh, a city which he had reared from a despicable collection of fishermen's huts to be one of the most magnificent towns in Europe. This court of police extended its jurisdiction over the whole provinces of the empire, regulating everything which regarded the maintenance of good order, watching over the improvement of trades and manufactures, and fixing the laws of commerce. The public laws of the empire were promulgated in a printed code. The courts of justice which were formerly filled with the nobility, without any trial of their capacity, or previ-

ous education requisite for that office, were supplied by Peter with judges of approved knowledge, education, and integrity. In ecclesiastical matters, instead of the office of the patriarch, which he had very early abolished, he instituted a perpetua synod of twelve members, over whom he himself occasionally presided and to this tribunal was allotted the supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

With respect to the government, or political constitution, of the empire of Russia, it must be considered as an absolute monarchy. Peter the Great, being the founder of a new constitution, was sovereign without limitation. His will was law. He aimed, however, at setting some bounds to the power of his successors; and in that view he instituted a senate, which, like the parliament of Paris, should possess the power of ratifying or giving authority to the acts of the sovereign; but in fact, there has ever been so strict a conformity between the will of the prince, and the decrees of this assembly, that the imperial power, instead of being abridged, seems rather to have been strengthened by it.

Such is a brief sketch of the rise of this extraordinary power, which the singular genius of one man was able to rear from the most unpromising materials. By the influence of his single mind, an obscure and barbarous people, almost unknown to history—without arts; without laws; under no regular organization of government; occupying a thinly-peopled and ill-cultivated country; possessed, in fact, of no political existence—have, within the course of a single century, overleaped all the intermediate steps of progressive civilization, and mounted at once to the highest rank among the powers of Europe.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

VIEW of the PROGRESS of SCIENCE and LITERATURE in EUROPE, from the END of the FIFTEENTH to the END of the SEVENTEENTH CENTURY:—Progress of Philosophy—Lord Bacon—Experimental Philosophy—Des Cartes—Galileo—Kepler—Logarithms—Circulation of the Blood—Royal Society of London Instituted—Sir Isaac Newton—Locke—Progress of Literature—Epic Poetry—Ariosto—Tasso—Milton—Lyric Poetry—Drama—English and French—History.

As one of the most useful objects of the study of history is to mark the progress of the human mind in those sciences and arts which either contribute to the great purposes of public utility, or conduce to the rational enjoyments of social life, we have endeavoured, through the course of this work, to exhibit, from time to time, a progressive picture of the state of the sciences and of literature. A former chapter on this subject embraced a very comprehensive period, from the revival of literature in Europe, to the end of the fifteenth century.

We have there observed how much literature was indebted to the discovery of the art of printing for its advancement and dissemination. Classical learning, the art of criticism, poetry, and history, among the sciences, began from that time to make a rapid progress in most of the kingdoms of Europe. It was not so, however, with philosophy, and the more abstract sciences; and the reason was obvious; the remains of ancient learning are to this day the models of a good taste in the "Belles Lettres," and the knowledge of the classical authors, poets, and historians, was no sooner revived, and their works disseminated, than they were successfully imitated by the moderns. In philosophy, on the contrary, the light which was borrowed from the works of the ancients served only to mislead and bewilder. The philosophy of Aristotle, which then had possession of the schools, or even the

more pleasing systems of Plato, which began to be opposed to his scholastic subtleties, were fetters upon all real improvement in philosophical researches. It was not till these were removed, till all the rubbish of the ancient philosophy was entirely cleared away, that men began to perceive, that, to understand the laws of nature, it was necessary to observe her phenomena, and to study her works; and that all systems and theories antecedent to such study were idle and absurd chimeras. We formerly remarked the commendable attempt which was made by our countryman, Roger Bacon, so early as the middle of the thirteenth century, to undermine the fabric of the Aristotelian philosophy, and to substitute experiment and observation to system and conjecture; but his attempt was ineffectual. There is nothing so difficult to be removed as dogmatism and pedantry. Conviction is a severe mortification of pride to a man who values himself upon his wisdom; besides, the philosophy of Aristotle had at this time become a part of the tenets of the church, and it was reckoned equally impious to combat any of the doctrines of that philosopher as to attack the fundamental articles of the Christian faith.

The learning of the schools continued then to reign triumphant, even down to the middle of the sixteenth century, when it received, at least in England, a mortal blow from a second philosopher of the same name, Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam, who flourished in the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth, and was afterward chancellor of England under James I. When we consider the vast variety of researches to which this great man has turned his attention, employed alternately in the study of nature, of the operations of the mind, of the sciences of morals, politics, and economics, we must allow him the praise of the most universal genius that any age has produced. But when, on an acquaintance with these works, we discern the amazing views which he has opened; the just

estimate he has formed of the knowledge of the preceding ages in every one of the sciences, the immense catalogue which he has given of the desiderata still to be known in each department, and the methods he has pointed out for prosecuting discoveries, and attaining that improvement of knowledge, we regard the intellect of Bacon as that of a superior being. In his treatise *de Augmentis Scientiarum*, and the *Novum Organum*, he enforces the necessity of experiment to the knowledge of nature. He exposes the absurdity of forming systems and theories antecedent to the recording of facts. He points out the numberless errors thence arising; and thus having purged philosophy of all its mystical and unintelligible jargon of terms, categories, essences, and universals, he points out the sure method of reasoning from experiment, so as to attain the knowledge of general laws.

Although the works of Bacon began to open the eyes of the learned world, and to unmask the futility of those researches in which philosophers had hitherto employed themselves, they produced this effect only by very slow degrees. In the continental kingdoms of Europe, the Aristotelian philosophy maintained its ground, even down to the seventeenth century. Gassendi, a native of Provence, about the year 1640, had ventured, with great caution, to dispute some of the principles of that philosophy, and, without availing himself of the works of Bacon, attempted to revive the atomic system of Epicurus; but he had very few followers.

Des Cartes soon after proposed his system of the world; in which, though he condemns the common practice of laying down vague conjectures for principles, he himself did nothing better. He sets out upon this principle, that, in order to form the universe, nothing else was requisite but matter and motion; that extension is the essence of all bodies, and space being extended as well as matter, there is no difference between space and matter, consequently there is no void

or vacuum in nature. He divides this homogeneous mass of space and matter into angular parts of a cubical form, leaving no interstices between them. "To these cubes," says he, "the Author of Nature gave a rotary motion round their axes, and likewise an impulse forward, which drives them round the sun as a centre." From the attrition of the parts in this rotation, he supposes the planets to be formed. This strange romance of the Vortices of Des Cartes struck at first by its novelty, and, in fact, seemed to explain several of the phenomena of nature. He gained a great number of disciples, and more admirers; and such is the dogmatism of opinion, that even after a complete detection of the errors of the Cartesian system, and the publication of the Newtonian philosophy, that of Des Cartes continued to have its advocates in France till the middle of the present century.

The Copernican system of the planets, which is now universally received, had been proposed long before the age of Des Cartes, and was adopted by him as the groundwork of his philosophy. Copernicus gave this system to the world in the year 1553. It was solemnly condemned by the Inquisition in the year 1615; at the very time when many new experiments and discoveries had concurred to establish its absolute certainty.

In the year 1609, Galileo constructed telescopes. We have formerly observed, that in the *Opus Majus* of Roger Bacon, there are plain intimations that the effect of a combination of convex glasses in approaching and magnifying distant objects, was known to that ingenious man: but there is reason to believe that after his time the invention was lost; nor was it recovered till about four hundred years afterward by Galileo. In the year 1610, Galileo, with a telescope which magnified the object thirty-six times, discovered the satellites of Jupiter, and their motion, the horned phases of the planet Venus, the extremities of the ring of Saturn, and the spots in the sun's disk which

showed its motion round its axis. For these discoveries, which tended to confirm the Copernican heresy, Galileo was thrown into prison by the inquisition, and forced to purchase his liberty by retracting his opinions.

Kepler, much about the same time, that is, toward the beginning of the seventeenth century, added to these discoveries the knowledge of the laws which regulate the motions of the planets. Copernicus and Tycho Brahé believed that they moved in a circular orbit round the sun. Kepler demonstrated that they move in ellipses, of which the sun forms one of the foci; that their motion is slower in their aphelion than in their perihelion; that is, slower when at a distance from the sun than when nearer—in such a proportion, that a ray or line drawn from the planet to the sun, would in the course of the planet's revolution pass over equal spaces in equal times. He discovered likewise the analogy between the distances of the several planets from the sun, and their periodical revolutions; and he found the great law that regulates the planets, that the squares of their periodical times was in the same proportion as the cubes of their mean distances from the sun.

The age of Kepler and Galileo was the era of great discoveries in the arts and sciences. The invention of the telescope gave rise to a thousand experiments by means of glasses; and the science of optics received great improvements. The new discoveries in astronomy led to improvements in navigation, and geometry, of course, made rapid advances toward perfection. The science of algebra, which Europe is said to have owed to the Arabians as well as the numeral ciphers, contributed greatly to abridge the labour of calculation; as did still more the invention of Logarithms discovered in the year 1614, by Napier of Merchiston. The improvement of mechanics kept pace with the advancement of geometry; and the science of natural philosophy was successfully culti-

vated in all its branches. The Torricellian experiment, made about the year 1640, determined the height of the atmosphere. Experiments upon the oscillations of pendulums which were found always to preserve an equal time, though the spaces described were unequal, suggested the idea of applying the pendulum to regulate the motions of a clock: and the observation that adding to its weight adds nothing to the celerity of its motion, led to the conclusion that the velocity with which a body gravitates to the centre is not in proportion to its weight. Galileo had discovered the laws which determine this velocity.

The ardour of prosecuting discoveries extended itself through the whole of the sciences. In the year 1616, Dr. Harvey made the great discovery of the circulation of the blood: at least he was the first who brought direct demonstration of the truth of that theory, which before his time had been only a matter of conjecture to some of the ablest anatomists. Hippocrates speaks of the *usual motion* of the blood, but had no idea of a constant and regular circulation. Servetus, about the middle of the sixteenth century, had remarked that the whole mass of blood passes through the lungs by the pulmonary artery and veins; but the discovery of the complete circulation of this fluid, passing from the heart by the arteries to every part of the body, and thence returning to the heart by the veins, is due to Harvey alone.

About the middle of the seventeenth century, the spirit of sound philosophy was vigorously promoted in England by the institution of the Royal Society. Some time after the civil wars, a few learned men, particularly Mr. Boyle, Dr Wilkins, Mr. Evelyn, Drs. Wallis and Wren, held private meetings for the sake of philosophical conversation. Cowley, the poet, had proposed in his works a very ingenious plan for a philosophical society, the idea of which he had probably borrowed from Lord Bacon's *House of Solomon* described in his fanciful work of the *New Atalantis*.

This plan of Cowley's contributed to the institution of a regular society by those gentlemen we have mentioned, which soon attracted the notice of Charles II., who granted to them his letters patent, and declared himself the founder and patron of the Royal Society of London. Experimental philosophy and natural history were the objects which deservedly engrossed their principal attention. The former of these Mr. Boyle prosecuted with great ingenuity and with the most successful industry. The world owed to him many valuable discoveries in chymistry, in mechanics, and in natural philosophy. He is distinguished by the invention of, or at least a great improvement in, the air-pump, and the experiments made *in vacuo*, which have thrown light upon almost every branch of the study of nature. To Mr. Evelyn, one of the first and most respectable members of the Royal Society, the world owes many ingenious works on agriculture, gardening, architecture, and sculpture. His excellent treatise, entitled *Sylva*, on the culture of trees, was read as one of the first discourses delivered before this society, and contributed to introduce a laudable and forward spirit in that most valuable of improvements through the whole of the island. In short, that emulation which characterizes all new institutions, gave rise to many ingenious treatises on a variety of branches of experimental philosophy and the study of nature.

Foreign nations began now to imitate the English in the foundation of similar societies for the improvement of philosophy. The Academia del Cimento at Florence, was established by the cardinal Leopold de Medicis, about the year 1655. Eleven years afterward, in the year 1666, Louis XIV., at the request of several of the French *literati*, founded the Royal Academy of Sciences. Colbert invited Cassini from Italy, and Huygens from Holland, to reside in Paris, and bestowed on them very liberal pensions. Soon after, the Royal Observatory of Paris was built at the king's

expense, and Picard and Cassini employed themselves in the construction of a meridian line. Picard was employed, in the year 1670, by the French Academy, to measure a degree of the meridian, which he found to be fifty seven thousand and sixty French toises and thence he made the first computation which approached to certainty of the size of the earth. Some of those great discoveries we have mentioned, and particularly that of the laws of the planetary motions laid down by Kepler, and the optical experiments of Galileo, paved the way for the immortal Newton.

This great man, whose genius far outshone all who have gone before him in the path of philosophy, and who has, perhaps, exhausted the most important discoveries of the laws of nature, so as not to leave to posterity the possibility of eclipsing his fame, had, it is certain, made the greatest of his discoveries before he had attained the age of twenty-four. Before that early period of life he had discovered the theory of universal gravitation. Dr. Pemberton, who has given an excellent view of his philosophy, informs us that Newton, as he sat one day alone in a garden, fell into a revery or speculation on the power of gravity. It occurred to him, that as this power is not found sensibly to diminish at the remotest distance to which we can ascend from the centre of the earth, for instance, at the top of the highest mountains, it was not unreasonable to suppose that it might extend much farther than was usually thought. Why not (said he to himself) as high as the moon? and if so, her motion must be influenced by it. Perhaps it is that which retains her in her orbit! However, though the power of gravity is not sensibly weakened in the little change of distance at which we can place ourselves from the centre of the earth, yet it is very possible that so high as the moon this power may differ much in strength from what it is here. To make an estimate what might be the degree of the diminution, he considered with himself that if the moon be

retained in her orbit by the force of gravity, no doubt the primary planets are carried round the sun by the like power; and by comparing the periods of the several planets with their distances from the sun, he found that if any power like gravity held them in their courses, its strength must decrease in the duplicate proportion of the increase of distance. Supposing, therefore, the power of gravity, when extended to the moon, to decrease in the same proportion, he computed whether that force would be sufficient to keep the moon in her orbit, and he found it would be sufficient. Newton had now the satisfaction to perceive that this inquiry, which an accidental thought had given rise to, led to the discovery of a universal law of nature, which solved the most striking of her phenomena. It is thus that genius proceeds, step by step, from the simplest principles to the most sublime conclusions.

Newton, amid many other discoveries, is immortalized by his theory of "Light and Colours." He analyzed the composition of light by means of the prism, and found that the smallest ray into which it can be separated is a compound substance, or *fasciculus*, consisting of several elementary rays distinct from each other, each tinged with a particular colour, and incapable of being further altered after this separation. He perceived that these coloured rays could not possibly be separated from each other—if their nature were not such, that in passing through the same medium they were refracted under different angles. This, together with the principle of the different reflexibility of different rays, is the fundamental discovery of Sir Isaac Newton in optics, from whence he has deduced the most important conclusions.

While natural philosophy was thus advancing by the efforts of the genius of Newton, his contemporary, Locke, exalted metaphysics into a rational science. The method which Bacon has proposed for the study of nature, Mr. Locke has ingeniously applied to the

study of the mind. It was not Locke's view or intention to form a plausible theory of the human understanding, as many metaphysicians had done before him. He wished to examine the mind as an anatomist does the body, and faithfully to record his observations. For this purpose he observes the visible signs of the first operations of the mind in an infant; he follows its progress up to maturity of reason; he compares these signs and his progress with the manifestation of the reasoning faculty in animals; and finding that from practice or experience, according as man or the animal advances in life, there is a gradual increase in the number of ideas, as well as an improvement in combining and modifying them, he very naturally draws this inference, that there are no innate ideas in the mind, but that they are all communicated to it gradually, either from the impressions of external objects, or by reflecting on these impressions; a conclusion which has very unjustly drawn upon Mr. Locke the imputation of skepticism in religion, as if it took away any argument from the existence of a God to maintain, that the mind did not intuitively perceive that truth, or to maintain that no such idea existed in the mind of an infant of a year old, but was the result of an improvement of reason. The truth is, the piety of Locke was one of the most remarkable features of his character.

LITERATURE.

The beginning of the sixteenth century, the pontificate of Julius II. and Leo X. was an era no less remarkable for the cultivation of the fine arts of painting, sculpture, and architecture, than for the higher species of poetical composition. Trissino, an Italian, was the first of the moderns who composed an epic poem in the language of his country. Trissino chose for his subject the delivering of Italy from the Goths by Belisarius under the emperor Justinian. The subject

was well chosen; and the poem, though very moderate in point of execution, had great success from the novelty of the attempt. The greatest fault of Trissino is that he copies Homer too closely in his descriptions, imitating even that which is generally esteemed a defect in the great father of epic poetry, his extreme minuteness in describing trivial particulars.

The Portuguese Camoens followed next; a poet possessed of much greater powers than Trissino. He had attended Vasco de Gama in the first voyage of the Portuguese to India by the Cape of Good Hope; and this great enterprise he celebrated in his poem called the "Lusiad," a great part of which he composed while upon the voyage—a work though irregular, abounding in poetical fire, and displaying the finest imagination. It has undergone many translations into the other languages of Europe, and is known in England by the able one of Mr. Mickle.

Toward the end of the sixteenth century, Spain likewise produced an epic poem of no inconsiderable merit, the "Araucana" of Don Alonzo Ercilla. What is remarkable in this poem is, that the author himself is the hero of it. Ercilla, who was a young man of talents and of an enterprising spirit, embarked for the province of Chili in South America. Upon the intelligence of a revolt of some of the natives against his sovereign, Philip II. of Spain, he raised a few troops, and carried on a long war with the inhabitants of Araucana, whom at length he reduced to submission and this war is the subject of his poem. It is a very irregular composition, but displays many strokes of true genius.

A work had sometime before this (about the middle of the sixteenth century) appeared in Italy, which engrossed the attention of all the literary world. This was the "Orlando Furioso" of Ariosto, an epic poem, which, with a total disregard of all the rules of this species of composition, without plan, without probability, without morality or decency, has the most cap-

tivating charms to all who are possessed of the smallest degree of genuine taste. Orlando is the hero of the piece, and he is mad. Eight books are consumed before the hero is introduced, and his first appearance is in bed desiring to sleep. His great purpose is to find his mistress Angelica; but his search of her is interrupted by so many adventures of other knights and damsels, each of them pursuing some separate object, few of which have any necessary relation to the great action of the piece, that it becomes almost impossible to peruse this poem with any degree of connexion between the parts. We are amused with a number of delightful stories, told with wonderful power of fancy and poetical genius; but in order to pursue any tale to an end, the reader must hunt for it through a dozen of books, for it is often cut short in the most interesting part, and resumed at the distance of five or six cantos, as abruptly as it had been broken off. There is no good moral in the adventures of the mad Orlando, and the scenes which the poet describes are often most grossly indecent; yet, with all its faults, the work of Ariosto will maintain its ground for ever, as furnishing a strange, irregular, but very high degree of pleasure.*

* Ariosto was a man of learning, and wrote admirably in the Latin tongue. Cardinal Bembo wished to persuade him to compose in that language, as being more universally intelligible than the Italian. "I would rather," said Ariosto, "be the first of the Italian writers than the second of the Latin." A delicate compliment to the person to whom he spoke; but, at the same time, a strong evidence of the high estimation in which he rated his own abilities.

He had an elegant villa at Ferrara, but of small extent; and on the front of his house was this apposite inscription —

"Parva, sed apta mihi, sed nulli obnoxia, sed non
Sordida, parta meo sed tamen ære, domus."

"A house small, but suitable for me, in debt to no one, not mean, bought with my own money."

To a friend who expressed his surprise, that he who had de

Tasso is much more of a regular genius than Ariosto; and in his poem of the *Gierusalemme Liberata* sometimes soars to a pitch of the sublime equal to the finest flights of Homer or of Virgil. He is peculiarly excellent in the delineation of his characters; but the episodes which he introduces have too little connexion with the principal action; as that, for instance, of Olinda and Sophronia, in the beginning of the poem, which, though a most beautiful episode, conduces nothing to the main design. It is now generally allowed that Boileau and Addison have much undervalued the merit of Tasso, when in contrasting him with Virgil, they speak of the tinsel ornaments of his poem compared with the gold of the other. Tasso, though not on the whole so correct a poet as Virgil, has his strokes of the sublime—his golden passages—which will stand the test of the severest criticism. In point of fancy and imagination, no poet has gone beyond him: witness the description of his enchanted forest; nor have we anywhere more beautiful examples of the true pathetic.

From the date of the Gierusalemme Liberata of Tasso the genius of epic poetry seems to have lain asleep for above a century, till the days of Milton; with the exception only of the Fairy Queen of Spenser, which has many detached passages abounding in beauties, but, as an intricate and protracted allegory, is dry and tedious upon the whole. The merits of the Paradise Lost have been so admirably illustrated by Addison in the Spectator, and the work itself, as well as his criticism, are so generally known, that it becomes entirely unnecessary in this place to bestow much time in characterizing it. Compared with the great epic poems of antiquity, the Iliad, the Odyssey, and the Æneid, the Paradise Lost has more examples of the true sublime than are to be found in all those

scribed so many stately and magnificent palaces in his Orlando, had built for himself so poor a fabric, he replied with laconic wit, "It is much easier to join words than stones."

compositions put together. At the same time, if examined by critical rules, it is not so perfect a work as any one of them; and there are greater instances of a mediocrity, and even sinking in composition, than are to be found in any of those ancient poems, unless in the sixth book, which is almost one continued specimen of the sublime. It is but seldom that the poet sustains himself for a single page without degenerating into bombast, false wit, or obscurity. The neglect of the merit of Milton during his own life is sufficiently known. Hume, in his History of England, mentions an anecdote which strongly marks the small regard that was had for this great poet, even by that party to whose service he had devoted his talents. Whitelocke, in his Memorials, talks of *one Milton, a blind man, who was employed in translating a treaty with Sweden into Latin!*

Lyric poetry during the sixteenth century was cultivated in many of the European kingdoms, but with no high success. The smaller poems, or Rhymes of Ariosto and of Tasso, have little tincture of that genius which shines in their greater compositions. They have servilely trod in the steps of Petrarch, and seem to have thought that lyric poetry admitted of no other species of composition than a sonnet or a canzonette in praise of a mistress. The only one among the Italians who truly merits the denomination of a lyric poet seems to be Chiabrera, in whose odes there is a wonderful brilliancy of imagination, and even a great portion of grandeur and the true sublime. It was an illustrious mark of honour which the town of Savona, his native city, paid to the merit of this great poet in declaring him perpetually exempted from all public taxes. Such were the rewards with which the Greeks and Romans were wont to distinguish literary genius.

The genius of the French, in the sixteenth century, seems not more adapted to lyric poetry than that of the Italians. The French poets, Ronsard and Bellary,

imitated the Italian sonnets of Petrarch, with all his false wit, but without his passion. Marot, however, in a few of his little tales, displays that *naïveté* and easy humour in which he was afterward so successfully rivalled by La Fontaine; but the French language was yet extremely harsh and unharmonious. It was not till the end of the sixteenth, and beginning of the seventeenth century, that the French versification received a considerable degree of polish from the compositions of Racan and Malherbe. Some of the odes of Malherbe have all the ease of Horace, as well as his incidental strokes of the sublime. Toward the end of the seventeenth century this species of poetry was cultivated in France, with high success, by La Farre, by Chapelle, and Bachaumont, by Chaulieu and Gresset, in whose compositions, besides infinite ease and spirit, we find a certain epigrammatic turn of wit, of which the compositions of the preceding age afford no example.

The English language was even later than the French in attaining that smoothness and harmony which is essential to lyric poetry. In the compositions of the sixteenth century, of Spenser, of the Earl of Surrey, of Sir John Harrington, and Sir Philip Sidney, we often find poetical imagery and great force of expression; but an entire ignorance of harmony and the power of numbers. The lyric pieces of Shakspeare himself bear but few traces of his great genius; nor from that time is there any sensible improvement in the English poetry for nearly half a century, till the time of Cowley and of Waller. The merit of Cowley has been variously estimated; but I believe, in general, rather undervalued. In his poems there is a redundancy of wit, and in his Pindaric odes particularly too great irregularity and often obscurity; yet many of his poetical pieces, where the subject itself restrained these faults, display the highest beauties. The elegy on the death of Mr. Harvey is extremely natural and pathetic. It is not a little extraordinary

that neither Dr. Hurd, who has given to the public a very judicious selection of the works of Cowley, nor Dr. Johnson in his life of this poet, should have mentioned one little piece, which it would perhaps be difficult to parallel for poetic beauties in any language:—this is a lyric ode, introduced in the third book of the Davideis, as sung by David under the window of his mistress, beginning, "Awake, awake, my lyre." I am much mistaken if this is not one of the best specimens of lyric poetry that ever was written. The fame of Cowley does not rest alone upon his poetical writings. His prose essays are uncommonly excellent, and exhibit a natural and pleasing picture of himself, a very amiable and accomplished character.

The verse of Waller is more polished and harmonious than that of any of the preceding or contemporary poets; but his compositions have a great deal of that quaintness and trifling witticism which was in fashion in his age, and he possesses no genius either for the sublime or the pathetic.

In the end of the seventeenth century, lyric poetry in England was carried to its highest perfection by Dryden. The ode on St. Cecilia's Day has never since been equalled; and it may even be pronounced equal to the best lyric compositions of antiquity. The genius of Dryden, as a poet, was universal. As a satirist, he has the keenness without the indelicacy of Horace or Juvenal. In this species of composition, his Mackflecknoe and Absalom and Achitophel have never been surpassed. He excels Boileau in this respect, that the satire of the French poet is too general, and therefore falls short of its great purpose, which is to amend. The author who makes mankind in general the subject of his censure or of his ridicule will do no good as a reformer. Dryden, as a fabulist, displays a very happy turn for the poetical narrative, and though the subjects of his fables are not his own, they are in general well chosen. The merit of his dramatic pieces,

though considerable, is not very high. He certainly possessed that invention which is the first quality of a dramatic poet; but he is very deficient in the expression of passion, and in his finest scenes we are inclined more to admire the art of the poet than to participate in the feelings of his characters.

In a former chapter upon the revival of European literature, we noticed the very rude state of dramatic poetry in Europe, even so late as the end of the fifteenth century. It was not till the end of the sixteenth, that this species of composition began to furnish anything like a rational entertainment. It was then that Lope de Vega in Spain, and Shakspeare in England, produced those incomparable pieces which, at this day, are the delight of their countrymen. The Spaniard possessed an inventive genius, equally fertile with that of the English poet; he had more learning, and went beyond him even in the rapidity of his compositions. His dramatic pieces amount to above three hundred, and he was often known to finish a play within four-and-twenty hours. It is not surprising that we should find numberless defects, great absurdities, and continual irregularity in the conduct of those hasty productions; but in most of them we discern the marks of a great and comprehensive genius, an inexhausted fund of imagination, and infinite knowledge of human nature.

The merits of Shakspeare have been often analyzed, and are familiar to every person of taste. He cannot be measured by the rules of criticism—he understood them not, and has totally disregarded them; but this very circumstance has given room for those beauties of unconfined nature and astonishing ebullitions of genius which delight and surprise in his productions, and which the rules of the drama would have much confined and repressed. I know not whether there is not something, even in the very absurdities of Shakspeare, which tends, by contrast, to exalt the lustre of his beauties and elevate his strokes of the

sublime. It is certain that dramatic poetry in England has not improved as it became more refined, and as our poets, in imitation of the French, became scrupulous observers of the unities. The old English drama, with all its irregularities, is incomparably superior to the modern, both in the nice delineation of character and in the natural expression of the passions. In the plays of Shakspeare, of Beaumont and Fletcher, and of Massinger, every person is a highly finished picture. We not only see the importance of each character to conduce to the plot, but, taking any character by itself, we have pleasure in contemplating it. Like a good painting, we admire not only the composition and the whole of the group, but if we confine our attention to a single figure, we find it beautifully drawn and highly finished. Most of the modern plays fall infinitely short in this respect. The persons taken singly are nothing—they have no strong features to distinguish them. A modern dramatic writer will paint a virtuous man or a vicious man; but he gives him nothing but the general marks of the character: you admire or you detest his actions, and you hear him speaking either good moral sentiments or purposes of villany; but examine this hero or this villain, he wants *particular features;* he cannot be described; he resembles those masks, or vizards, which were worn by the Greek and Roman comedians, of which one was painted to express each of the passions, and the same mask was constantly worn as often as the same passion was to be represented.

In the modern plays, too, a correctness of language, a harmony of numbers, and a brilliancy of metaphor, have come in place of that natural warmth, that unforced and passionate expression, which eminently distinguished the old dramatic compositions. The tragi-comedy (I do not mean where there are two distinct plots, which is a very unnatural species of composition, but where there is a mixture in the same plot of serious and ludicrous personages) seems now

to be laid aside by our dramatic writers, de erred, as it would appear, by the censure of Addison; yet, with great deference to so judicious a critic, I cannot help thinking that his opinion would deprive us of a very rational source of pleasure. We may appeal to the example of some of the finest plays in our language whether the introducing a comic scene has a bad effect, even when succeeding or succeeded by another of the deepest distress. Where the comic characters have their business in the tragic plot, and the whole tends to one interesting event, as there is nothing but what is consonant to nature in such mixture of characters, so there is nothing which shocks our feelings. It is not unnatural that clownish servants should jest while their master is in affliction; and a short scene of this kind, exhibited as it were in passing on to the serious parts, instead of violating our feelings, has the effect perhaps of heightening our pathetic emotions, by the sudden, strong, and unexpected contrast of happiness and misery. The old dramatic writers perhaps went to an extreme, and sacrificed too much to the taste of a populace delighted with ribaldry and buffoonery; but *they* certainly err as much on the other side who have banished all association of the comic and the tragic in the same composition.

To those who are admirers of a strict conformity to dramatic rules, we would recommend the compositions of the French stage toward the middle of the last century. If dramatic poetry is to be considered as an exhibition of the characters of mankind, which some very good critics have defined it to be, the French drama, in this respect, at least their tragedy, must be allowed to be much inferior to the English. If considered as an artificial composition, recommending virtue by example, and exposing vice, we acknowledge the drama of the French to have better attained those important ends. In the dramatic compositions of either nation, we find there is room for the introduction both of sublime and of pathetic senti-

ments; but in the French drama we admire the art of the poet, who describes a feeling, while in the English we sympathize with the character who expresses it.

Till the middle of the seventeenth century, dramatic poetry among the French was extremely low. Pierre Corneille is allowed to have brought it at once to the highest pitch of excellence which it has ever attained. We cannot say that Corneille has not availed himself of the compositions in other languages; for besides that the correct regularity of his pieces demonstrates a thorough acquaintance with the rules of the drama, he has borrowed some of his plots both from the Greek tragedians and some of the dramatic writers of Spain. Yet a proof that the genius of Corneille was more original than the effects of study, is, that his earliest pieces, written in his youth, are better than those which were the fruit of his maturer years and more cultivated judgment. Of thirty-three pieces, there are no more than six or seven which still keep possession of the French stage, and will probably maintain their ground for ever. The tragedy of the Cid, Rodogune, Cinna, Polyeucte, Les Horaces, have never yet been surpassed by any dramatic writers among the French. The Menteur of Corneille shows that his genius could adapt itself equally to comedy and to tragedy. This great poet enjoyed already a very high reputation, when Racine appeared, to dispute with him the palm of dramatic composition. Corneille, with more of the sublime of poetry, had less acquaintance with the tender passions. It is here that the *forte* of Racine lay. The pathetic of Britannicus is superior to anything that Corneille has attempted in the same style. Athalie is full of grandeur and dignity of sentiment, and the comedy of the Plaideurs shows that the genius of Racine was as universal as that of his great competitor.

But the palm of French comedy was reserved for Molière. It may perhaps be said of the comedies of

Molière, that they are the only examples of that species of composition which have actually produced a sensible effect in reforming the manners of the age. The French physicians in his time were precisely what he represents them—illiterate, mysterious, and ignorant quacks. The women of fashion were overrun with a pedantic affectation of learning; and the French nobility affected that arrogant and supercilious demeanour which demands respect from the consideration of birth or fortune, without the possession of a single laudable or valuable quality. The keen but delicate satire of Molière produced a very sensible reformation; and the latter part of the reign of Louis XIV. was as entirely free from the quackery of physic, the pedantry of the ladies, and the absurd pride of the nobility, as the commencement of it was marked by those characteristics.

The last eminent dramatic writer among the French who distinguished the seventeenth century was Crebillon, who is the only one of the French poets of the stage, if we except Voltaire, who has drawn his images of the sublime from the source of terror. In tragedy he had before him the models of Corneille and Racine, but his genius was original, and he disdained to imitate. His pieces are, therefore, deficient in that correctness, or that polish in the structure of the verses, which is the fruit of study and of imitation; but he must be a tasteless critic, who, in reading the tragedy of Radamiste et Zénobie, or of Atrée et Thyeste, feels his passions so disengaged as to attend to the irregularity of a verse or the harshness of a cadence. Let us observe, too, to the honour of Crebillon, that in all his pieces virtue and morality are powerfully inculcated—a characteristic to distinguish him from a worthless son, the younger Crebillon, who, in a variety of licentious novels, has prostituted excellent talents in the service of vice.

With the mention of the principal historians who

adorned the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, I close this hasty sketch of European literature.

In France we find, as historians of that period, De Thou and Davila. The History of the president De Thou, comprehending the annals of his own time, from 1545 to 1607, is written with great judgment and impartiality. He wrote in Latin, and his style, with considerable purity, has an uncommon degree of force and elevation. Davila, an Italian, has no other title to be classed among the French historians than having long resided in France, and written of the affairs of that kingdom. His history of the civil wars of France, from the death of Henry II. to the peace of Vervins, in 1598, and the establishment of Henry IV. upon the throne, is written in excellent Italian, and, if considered as the composition of a partisan, is marked by no common degree of candor and impartiality.

In Italy, Machiavel, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, composed his History of Florence, a work classical in point of style, though not always to be depended on in point of fact. Bentivoglio, in his History of the Civil Wars of Flanders, has united great political knowledge with perspicuity of narration and force of language. He is often wonderfully eloquent. As a model of the perfect historian style, we cannot recommend a finer example than Bentivoglio's introduction to the work we have mentioned.

Among the English historians, Sir Walter Raleigh possesses a purity of language remarkable for the times in which he lived: for the age of James I. was distinguished by a false and vicious taste in writing. But his chief excellence is his judicious selection of facts. His History of the World, though a work of great judgment and perspicuity, is yet in point of style rather beneath that dignity of expression which is required in historical composition.

Clarendon has great natural powers; no author possessed more acuteness in discerning characters, or a happier talent in delineating them. He is an au-

thor who is looked upon as a party writer, as every writer must be who gives the history of a period distinguished by the violence of party, and who relates transactions in which he himself was actively concerned. But Clarendon was a man of virtue and probity: he never wilfully misleads; and if we cannot implicitly assent to his political creed, we respect his talents and revere his integrity.

At this period of the history of the world, the department of Universal History may be said to terminate. It would certainly be desirable that any work on so comprehensive a subject should include the widest range in point of time, and even embrace the events of the present age; but many circumstances conspire to render this difficult in a work on general history, and almost impossible in the form and for the purpose for which this work was composed, viz., as a course of lectures delivered from an academical chair in the University of Edinburgh. The quantity of important matter which accumulates as we reach the more recent periods—the interest which attaches itself to innumerable events, less from their actual importance, than from their connexion with the feelings and passions of the present day—conspire to render the materials of recent history of a magnitude so disproportioned to those which form the narrative of more distant periods, that no discrimination could suffice to condense them within the requisite compass. It is the lapse of time alone that settles the relative importance of such materials; that throws into the shade, or blots out from the canvass, those details which, however interesting they may seem to the actors, are of no real value to posterity; and leaves the great picture of human affairs charged with such features only as deserve a lasting memorial, and preserve their importance long after their immediate interest has ceased to enhance it.

It is not, therefore, in a work on General History that the student must expect to obtain a knowledge

of his own times, or of those which immediately precede them; but the general views which he may here receive of the history of former ages, and that method and arrangement which he will here find pursued, will enable him to prosecute his historical studies with more real benefit to himself, and with less risk of being led astray by the partial and often contradictory statements of contemporary annalists.

END OF VOL. V.

OCT 19 1928